

COMPARISON OF CURRENT LAW WITH ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE, AND SENATE ESEA REAUTHORIZATION PROPOSALS

TITLE I – HELPING DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN MEET HIGH STANDARDS

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Overall Purpose</u> To help low-achieving children in high-poverty schools meet challenging State standards that all children are expected to meet.	Unchanged. Makes minor revisions to update supporting statements (needs, lessons learned, and means for achieving the purpose) with findings from recent research and evaluations.	To ensure that all children have a fair and equal opportunity to obtain a high-quality education.	Unchanged.

Title I, Part A

<u>State Plan</u> Requires comprehensive State plans, subject to peer review and approval by the Secretary, demonstrating that the State has developed or adopted State standards and assessments in at least reading or language arts and mathematics.	Also requires States to describe how they will develop and implement statewide accountability systems, based on State standards and assessments, that meet specified criteria. Plan to be coordinated with IDEA and the Perkins Act.	Requires development or adoption of science standards by school year 2005-2006. Requires Secretary to withhold administrative funds from States that do not have in place challenging State content and student performance standards. Same as Administration bill.	Similar to current law, but may require science standards by 2005 (language is ambiguous). Also requires States to disseminate effective parental involvement practices to LEAs and schools. Requires plan to be coordinated with IDEA, Perkins, and Head Start.
--	---	--	---

¹As reflected in the Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999.

²House action as reflected in Students Results Act of 1999 (H.R. 2), Teacher Empowerment Act (H.R. 1995), Academic Achievement for All Act (Straight A’s Act, H.R. 2300), and Impact Aid Reauthorization Act of 2000 (H.R. 3616), each as passed by the House. Also reflects the Literacy Involves Families Together Act (H.R. 3222) and the Education Opportunities to Protect and Invest in Our Nation’s Students (Education OPTIONS) Act (H.R. 4141) as reported by the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. The full House has not acted on those two bills.

³Senate action as reflected in S. 2, as reported out of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p><u>State Assessments</u></p> <p>Requires that, by 2001, all SEAs have final State assessment systems in place to measure the performance of students in Title I schools against State standards.</p> <p>Specifies that State assessments be designed to assess students' performance in mastering complex skills and challenging subject matter and be administered in at least reading and mathematics at some time during grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12.</p> <p>Requires SEAs to assess limited English proficient (LEP) children, to the extent practicable, in the language and form most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what these students know and can do.</p>	<p>Clarifies that assessments must be used starting with school year 2000-2001.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Adds requirements that: (1) in content areas other than English, Spanish-speaking LEP children be assessed with tests written in Spanish (if the tests are likely to produce more accurate results than English-language tests), and (2) all students who have attended U.S. schools (except in Puerto Rico) for three or more consecutive years be assessed in reading or language arts using tests written in English.</p>	<p>Same as Administration, but adds requirement for science assessments by school year 2005-2006.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Adds requirement for assessment of students who have been in U.S. schools (except for Puerto Rico) for three or more consecutive years using tests written in English, with LEA discretion to use tests in language other than English for one additional year.</p>	<p>Does not clarify use of assessments by 2000-2001, but may require science assessments by 2005.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Same as House bill, but no 1-year exception at LEA discretion.</p>
<p><u>State Accountability</u></p> <p>Holds LEAs and schools accountable for making “adequate yearly progress” toward enabling participating students to meet the State’s proficient and advanced performance standards in at least reading and math.</p>	<p>Holds LEAs and schools accountable for continuous and substantial gains in overall student performance and in the performance of the lowest-achieving students in at least reading and math.</p>	<p>Strengthens adequate yearly progress requirements to include numerical goals for improving overall student performance and for narrowing achievement gaps between groups of students. Requires that adequate yearly progress be defined to</p>	<p>Similar to current law, except that AYP definition must ensure that all children meet proficient or advanced level within 10 years.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
No comparable provision.	Accommodates a single accountability system that includes Title I by allowing States that have shown substantial overall achievement gains and a reduction in the achievement gap between high-performing and low-performing students to use their own procedures for identifying and intervening in low-performing LEAs and schools.	<p>ensure that each group of students meets or exceeds the proficient level within 10 years of enactment. States that fail to implement a system for measuring adequate yearly progress would lose administrative funding.</p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	No comparable provision.
<p><u>Accountability/Report Cards</u></p> <p>Requires LEAs and States, respectively, to publicize and disseminate individual school profiles and results from the State review of the progress of each LEA toward meeting the State's adequate yearly progress targets. Assessment results must be disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, race, LEP and migrant status, poverty, and disability.</p>	Requires (under proposed Title XI) State-level, LEA-level, and school-level report cards that include Title I and non-Title I schools. State-level report cards must include aggregate student performance in reading/language arts and math, attendance and graduation rates, average class size for each school district in the State, information on school safety, information on the professional qualifications of teachers in the State, and disaggregated student achievement data.	Requires States to prepare and disseminate annual report cards for all Title I schools no later than the beginning of the 2001-2002 school year. If States do not provide report cards, they must report the same information through "other public means." State report cards must include disaggregated student performance on statewide assessments for at least reading and mathematics (science must be added by 2005-2006), retention in grade, completion of AP courses, 4-year graduation rates, the professional qualifications of teachers and	Similar to current law, but requires States to prepare and disseminate annual performance reports for LEAs, and LEAs to prepare and disseminate reports for Title I schools.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	<p>LEA and school report cards must also include information on the number of low-performing schools, and information that shows how students in the LEA or school performed on statewide assessments compared to students in the rest of the State or LEA.</p>	<p>paraprofessionals and the ratio of paraprofessionals to teachers in the classroom.</p> <p>LEA report cards must also include the number and percentage of schools identified for school improvement and a comparison of student performance in the LEA vs. in the State as a whole.</p> <p>School report cards must say whether the school has been identified for school improvement and compare student performance with that of students in the LEA and the State as a whole.</p> <p>LEAs also would be required to provide to parents, upon request, information regarding the professional qualifications of their classroom teachers and paraprofessionals.</p>	<p>No similar provision.</p> <p>No similar provision.</p> <p>No similar provision.</p>
<p><u>State Support for Improvement</u></p> <p>Requires State mechanisms to, at a minimum, identify "distinguished" educators and schools, and create a statewide system of "school support teams."</p>	<p>Requires a State support system for LEAs and schools that may include, for example, school support teams, distinguished educators, and a peer-review process to improve school improvement plans.</p>	<p>Same as Administration bill, except no peer-review of school improvement plans.</p>	<p>Same as Administration bill, including a "review process" to improve school improvement plans.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>State Reservation for School Improvement</u> Requires SEAs to reserve at least \$200,000 (and permits them to reserve up to .5 percent) of combined allocations for Title I LEA grants, State Migrant, and State Neglected and Delinquent grants for school improvement purposes.	Requires SEAs to reserve 2.5 percent of their Title I LEA Grant funds for accountability and school improvement activities. The amount would rise to 3.5 percent in fiscal year 2003. Requires SEAs to allocate at least 70 percent of the reserved funds to LEAs.	Authorizes reservation of .5%, but limits it to Title I LEA Grants only; no required minimum.	Requires Secretary to reserve 50 percent of Part A appropriations over \$8.1 billion for grants to States for assessment development, school improvement, and academic achievement awards.
<u>Priorities for State Assistance</u> Gives priority for assistance from school support teams to schoolwide programs; then, if funds are sufficient, to schools identified for improvement and with at least 75% poverty.	Gives first priority to LEAs subject to corrective action and schools for which an LEA failed to carry out its responsibilities relating to technical assistance and corrective action, and second priority to LEAs identified for improvement.	Same as Administration bill.	Same as Administration bill.
<u>Local plans</u> Requires comprehensive LEA plans tied to State standards and assessments and defines plan requirements.	Adds requirement that LEAs describe actions to assist low-performing schools and how the agency will promote the use of extended learning time. Adds requirement for description of assessments used to determine literacy levels of first-graders, including administration to students in the language most likely to yield valid results.	Same as Administration bill. Similar to Administration bill, except no requirement to test students in language most likely to yield valid results.	Mostly same as current law. No similar provision.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	<p>Requires coordination of plans with IDEA and Perkins.</p> <p>Adds requirement that SEAs peer review all LEA plans as part of the State approval process.</p>	<p>Requires coordination with IDEA, Perkins, and Head Start.</p> <p>Not included.</p>	<p>Same as House bill.</p> <p>Not included.</p>
<p><u>Local Plans/LEP Provisions</u></p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>Requires schools to annually assess the progress of LEP students in learning English and use that information to modify instruction; first grade literacy diagnostic assessment to be in the language most likely to yield valid results.</p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>Not included.</p> <p>LEAs must document effort to obtain informed parental consent before placing a LEP child in an English language instruction program that is tailored for LEP children or includes the use of native language instruction. Parents of LEP children participating in an English language instruction program may choose the method of instruction, if more than one is offered, and may remove their children from the program upon request.</p>	<p>Not included.</p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>
<p><u>LEA and School Improvement</u></p> <p>Establishes a several-stage process for LEA and school improvement, requiring that: (1) LEAs identify schools not</p>	<p>Requires schools, within 3 months of identification for improvement, to develop or revise plans that include research-based</p>	<p>Mostly the same as Administration bill; adds new requirement for parental notification when LEAs or schools are</p>	<p>Similar to House bill, but would require choice options within 6 months of identification for improvement, compared to 18 months in House bill.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>making adequate progress for two consecutive years; (2) identified schools revise Title I plans in the year after being identified; (3) LEAs help identified schools improve; and (4) ultimately, LEAs take corrective actions against schools that repeatedly fail.</p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>strategies and specific goals and objectives.</p> <p>Requires LEAs to peer review school improvement plans.</p>	<p>identified for improvement, and for students enrolled in such schools to have the option of transferring to another public school.</p> <p>No provision for peer review of school improvement plans.</p>	<p>Requires LEA to subject school improvement plans to a “review process,” contingent on approval within 1 month of submission.</p>
<p><u>Limitation on LEA Administrative Costs</u></p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>LEAs may not use more than 4 percent of their Part A funds for administrative expenses. The Secretary, in consultation with State and local officials and school finance experts, is required to develop and issue regulations defining administrative costs under Title I.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>
<p><u>Title I Instructional Staff</u></p> <p>Requires Title I schools to provide instruction using highly-qualified staff.</p>	<p>Adds requirement that all new teachers paid with Title I funds be certified in the field in which they will teach, or have a bachelor's degree and be enrolled in a program to obtain certification within 3 years.</p>	<p>Requires all new teachers to be “fully qualified,” and all teachers to be fully qualified by December 31, 2003. “Fully qualified” is defined as State certification or licensure. In addition, elementary school teachers must hold a bachelor’s degree and demonstrate knowledge and teaching skills in the elementary school</p>	<p>Retains current law emphasis on type of professional development provided and does not strengthen qualifications for teachers or paraprofessionals.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Allows aides employed with Title I funds to provide classroom instruction under the direct supervision of a teacher. Requires that instructional aides be under the direct supervision of a teacher and have (or will obtain within two years of employment) a secondary school diploma or recognized equivalent, unless an aide has proficiency in a language other than English that is needed to enhance the participation of eligible children.	Phases out the use of aides for classroom instruction: (1) raises minimum qualifications for paraprofessionals who, by July 1, 2002, must have completed at least 2 years of college to perform one-on-one tutoring, assist with classroom management, or provide assistance in a computer laboratory; and (2) specifies that a paraprofessional with a secondary school diploma who has not completed at least 2 years of college may perform only non-instructional duties, such as improving parental involvement, providing support in a library or media center, or acting as a translator.	<p>curriculum. Middle and secondary school teachers must hold a bachelor's degree and have majored in the subject areas in which they provide instruction or have passed a rigorous State or local test in those subject areas.</p> <p>All paraprofessionals hired one year or more after enactment of bill must have completed two years of college, have an associate's degree, or have met "a rigorous standard of quality" beyond a high school diploma. Existing paraprofessionals must meet same standards within 3 years after enactment. Translators or aides working only on parental involvement activities are exempt from these requirements.</p> <p>Expands definition of paraprofessional duties to include "instructional services," which must be provided only under direct supervision of fully qualified teacher.</p>	No comparable provision.
<u>Professional Development</u> Requires schools to provide ongoing professional development for school staff working with disadvantaged students.	No change.	No substantive change.	No substantive change.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Requires a school identified for school improvement to devote an amount, from any source, equivalent to at least 10 percent of one year's Part A allocation to professional development activities conducted during two consecutive years, or otherwise demonstrate that it is effectively carrying out professional development activities.	Requires that all participating LEAs use at least 5 percent of annual Title I Part A allocations for professional development (10 percent for fiscal year 2003 and thereafter), whether or not the LEA (or any of its schools) is identified for improvement.	No requirement for specific set-aside of Part A allocations for professional development.	Retains 10-percent professional development set-aside for schools identified for improvement, but unclear over what period funds must be used.
<u>Schools eligible for Title I funds</u> A public school with a percentage of students from low-income families as high or higher than the districtwide average, or at least 35 percent, is eligible for Title I funds.	Clarifies that LEAs may extend eligibility for one additional year to ineligible schools that received funds in the previous fiscal year.	Same as Administration bill.	Same as Administration bill.
<u>Ranking and Serving Schools</u> If funds are insufficient to provide services in all eligible schools, an LEA with 1,000 or more students must rank and serve all schools (including middle and high schools) with poverty rates above 75 percent before serving other schools. Below the 75 percent poverty cut-off, LEAs may rank all eligible schools by poverty rate, or separately rank schools within grade span, and must then serve them in rank order. Also, an LEA must allocate a minimum amount per poor child	Clarifies that an LEA may allocate a greater per-child amount to higher-poverty schools than to lower-poverty schools.	Raises enrollment required for exemption from rank-order rules from 1,000 to 1,500. Permits LEAs to serve elementary schools above 75 percent poverty before middle and high schools above 75 percent.	Same as current law.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
unless all schools served have poverty rates of 35 percent or higher.			
<u>Children eligible for Title I services</u> Each public school receiving Title I funds establishes its own educational criteria for selecting and serving students who are failing, or at risk of failing, to meet State academic standards.	Requires services for homeless children who do not attend Title I schools.	Same as Administration bill.	No change.
<u>Services to Private School Children</u> Requires LEAs to provide Title I services to eligible private school children residing in participating public-school attendance areas; the level of services is determined by the amount of funds generated by poor private-school children.	Adds language clarifying and expanding the level of consultation required between the LEA and private school officials.	Similar to Administration bill, but adds requirement for written confirmation to SEA of LEA consultation with private school officials. Also adds to issues for consultation “consideration and analysis of the views of private school officials on the provision of contract services through potential third-party providers.”	Same as House bill.
<u>School Choice</u> LEAs may use Part A funds to support programs that permit parents of Title I children to select the public school their children attend. Only Title I schools may participate in such programs, and funds may not be used to pay transportation costs.	No change.	Extends parents’ choice of schools to “charter schools and any other public school” except those identified for improvement or subject to corrective action. Permits use of Part A funds to pay transportation costs.	No change.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		Adds new <u>Public Safety and Family School Choice</u> program that permits victims of in-school crimes or students attending schools designated as “unsafe” by the State to attend another public or charter school selected by their parents.	<p>Same as House bill (adds Pupil Safety and Family School Choice provision).</p> <p>Adds a Title I <u>Child Centered Demonstration</u> program that would provide \$500 million for up to 10 States and 20 LEAs that operate open enrollment systems. Fund would be combined with regular Title I funds to create individual student vouchers that could be used to pay for supplemental education services from either the participating LEA or another public or private tutorial assistance provider selected by a child’s parents. States would no longer be required to target funds on poor students or high-poverty schools. Proposal is unclear on whether a student could use the voucher to simply transfer to a regular private school program.</p>
<p><u>Schoolwide programs</u></p> <p>Permits schools with at least 50 percent poverty to operate schoolwide programs that combine Federal, State, and local funds to improve the overall instructional program for all children in a school.</p>	No change.	Lowers threshold for schoolwide programs to 40 percent.	Same as House bill.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Specifies 8 components of schoolwide programs that focus on: needs assessment, reform strategies, instruction by highly qualified staff, professional development, parent involvement, transition from preschool, teachers' involvement in assessments, and activities to help students having difficulty mastering challenging standards.	<p>Restructures schoolwide components to focus on 3: (1) comprehensive needs assessment; (2) a coherent research-based design, based on the needs assessment, to improve teaching and learning throughout the school; and (3) regular review of the school's progress in implementing its program and achieving its goals for student achievement.</p> <p>Requires LEA peer review of schoolwide plans.</p>	<p>No substantive change.</p> <p>No peer review required.</p>	<p>No substantive change.</p> <p>No peer review required.</p>
<p><u>Targeted Assistance Schools</u></p> <p>Title I schools that are ineligible for or choose not to operate schoolwide programs must carry out targeted assistance programs, which focus services on students identified as failing or most at risk of failing to meet State standards. These schools increase the amount and quality of student learning for identified students by: helping them master the same challenging curriculum as other students; and giving primary consideration to instructional arrangements, such as after-school, weekend, and summer programs, that allow participating children to receive all the classroom instruction other children receive, in addition to Title I services.</p>	No substantive change.	No substantive change.	No substantive change.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Federal formula allocations</u> Requires that amounts appropriated for Title I LEA Grants in excess of the fiscal year 1995 appropriation for Title I Basic and Concentration Grants be allocated as Targeted Grants. [Appropriations bills have overridden this requirement, and Targeted Grants have never been funded.] Limits Puerto Rico's allocations by capping its average per-pupil expenditure at 32 percent of the lowest average per-pupil expenditure of any of the 50 States.	Requires that Targeted Grants receive the greater of: (1) 20 percent of the Title I LEA Grant appropriation; or (2) the amount exceeding the fiscal year 1995 appropriation for Basic and Concentration Grants. Phases in changes to ensure that Puerto Rico receives Title I allocations on the same basis as the 50 States and D.C. by fiscal year 2005.	Gives Targeted Grants 50 percent of Part A appropriations in excess of the 1999 level. Adds 85 percent hold-harmless provision for Concentration Grants and permits ineligible LEAs to receive Concentration Grants at hold-harmless level for up to four years. Provides partial phase-in of equal treatment for Puerto Rico, but limits it by precluding any resulting reduction of funding to any other State or DC.	Allocates all funds in excess of FY 2000 appropriation through Targeted Grants formula, though half of these funds would be reserved for new State grants for assessment development, school improvement, and academic achievement awards. Sliding 95-90-85 percent hold-harmless provision is provided for all formulas, and LEAs would receive allocations at hold-harmless levels for up to five years after losing eligibility. Maintains current limit on allocations to Puerto Rico.
<u>Capital Expenses</u> Authorizes capital expenses to help meet LEA administrative costs necessary to provide alternative delivery systems for religious-school students, in compliance with the Supreme Court's 1985 <u>Aguilar v. Felton</u> decision (which was overturned in 1997).	Repeals the authority.	Repeals authority effective September 30, 2002.	Repeals the authority and phases out funding in 2003.
<u>Evaluation</u> Authorizes a separate appropriation for Title I evaluation.	Deletes separate authorization; permits the Secretary to reserve not more than .3	No change.	Unchanged.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Requires a National Assessment of Title I programs and a longitudinal National Evaluation of Title I.	<p>percent from the total amount appropriated for Title I for evaluations; partnership activities with States to develop management information systems; applied research, technical assistance, dissemination, and recognition activities; and updates of Census data used for Title I allocations.</p> <p>No substantive change.</p>		
<p><u>Program Indicators</u></p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	Requires States to report annual progress of LEAs and schools in meeting specified performance indicators for student performance, school improvement, teacher qualifications, and parental involvement.	Not included.	Not included.
<p><u>Comparability of Resources</u></p> <p>Requires that LEAs provide, from State and local funds, services in Title I schools that are at least comparable to those provided in non-Title I schools. LEAs meet comparability requirements either by filing an assurance with the SEA that includes an LEA salary schedule, a policy to ensure equivalence among schools in teachers and other staff, and a policy to</p>	Changes the current tests of comparability by requiring an LEA to ensure comparable quality between Title I and non-Title I schools in terms of: pupil-teacher ratios and the qualifications of teachers; curriculum and other instructional materials and resources; and the condition and safety of school facilities, including access to technology.	No change.	No change.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
ensure equivalence in curriculum materials and instructional supplies; or by demonstrating comparability through other measures such as pupil/teacher ratios.			

Title I, Part B, Even Start

<p><u>Reservation of Funds</u></p> <p>Requires the Secretary to reserve 5 percent of the Even Start appropriation for programs for children of migratory workers, the outlying areas, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and one project in a prison that houses women and their preschool-age children.</p>	<p>Broadens the requirement for a prison literacy project by permitting the use of set-aside funds for projects serving other populations, including families that are homeless or that have children with severe disabilities. Retains use of set-aside funds for programs serving migratory workers, the outlying areas, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations.</p>	<p>Requires the Secretary to reserve 5 percent of the Even Start appropriation (or 6 percent when the appropriation exceeds \$200 million) for programs for children of migratory workers, the outlying areas, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations. Requires the Secretary to make a competitive award to one project in a prison that houses women and their pre-school-age children, not just when the amount reserved for the set-aside for special population exceeds \$4.6 million.</p>	<p>Same as current law, except: (1) requires the Secretary to reserve 6 percent of funds for programs for children of migratory workers, the outlying areas, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and the prison project if the amount appropriated exceeds \$250 million; and (2) requires the Secretary to make a competitive award to one project in a prison that houses women and their preschool-age children, not just when the amount reserved for these activities exceeds \$4.6 million.</p>
<p>Permits the Secretary to reserve not more than 3 percent for evaluation, technical assistance, program improvement, and replication activities.</p>	<p>Permits a reservation of 1 percent for technical assistance, program improvement, and replication activities. Deletes evaluation from the list of authorized activities. (Even Start evaluation would be supported through the reservation of not more than .3 percent for</p>	<p>Permits the Secretary to reserve not more than 3 percent for evaluation, technical assistance, program improvement, and replication activities. In years where the appropriation exceeds the amount appropriated for the previous fiscal year, the Secretary is required to reserve</p>	<p>Same as current law, but adds a provision that requires the Secretary to reserve, when the amount reserved for evaluation, technical assistance, program improvement, and replication exceeds the amount appropriated for the previous year, the lesser amount of \$2 million or</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Requires the Secretary to award competitive grants to States, from \$10 million reserved from Reading Excellence Act (REA) funds, for "statewide family literacy initiatives."	<p>evaluation from the total amount appropriated for Title I.)</p> <p>Permits the Secretary to make grants for Statewide family literacy initiatives by reserving funds from the Even Start appropriation.</p>	<p>\$2 million or 50 percent, whichever is less, from the excess amount for the National Institute for Literacy to carry out research that is scientifically based reading research and that focuses on adult literacy.</p> <p>Language is inconsistent. Even Start language would require the Secretary to reserve at least \$1 million for competitive grants to States if the appropriation exceeds the previous year's and at least one State applies, but REA language would continue to require the Secretary to award competitive grants to States, from \$10 million reserved from Reading Excellence Act funds, for statewide family literacy initiatives.</p>	<p>50 percent of the excess reservation, for research.</p> <p>Same as the Administration's bill.</p>
<p><u>State Plan</u></p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>Requires a one-time State plan that includes (or describes progress toward) indicators of program quality and how the State will use indicators to monitor and fund projects, and how the State will help projects implement program elements, conduct subgrant competitions, and coordinate resources to improve family literacy services.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>Same as the Administration's bill.</p>
<p><u>Uses of Funds and Eligible Participants</u></p> <p>Requires grant recipients to provide family-centered education programs that</p>	<p>Same as current law.</p>	<p>Adds a provision that allows States to use a portion of program funds to provide</p>	<p>Same as House bill.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
involve parents and children from birth through age 7.		training and technical assistance to family literacy providers. Also allows Even Start programs that collaborate with Title I, Part A programs to expand Even Start services to children who are 8 years of age or older if funds from the Part A program are used to contribute to the cost of providing programs for these children.	
<p><u>Program elements</u></p> <p>Lists required elements for each Even Start program with regard to identification, recruitment, and screening of families, instruction, staff training, program services, operation, and coordination.</p>	<p>Adds requirements that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Within 4 years, all instruction be provided by teachers who have at least a bachelor's degree, and all new teachers hired also be certified in the field in which they are teaching or be enrolled in a program to obtain certification within two years. ▪ Paraprofessionals who provide instructional support services must have completed, by July 1, 2002, at least two years of college and work under the direct supervision of a teacher. Paraprofessionals providing non-instructional services must have a secondary school diploma or its equivalent. ▪ All programs utilize research-based instructional approaches, provide at least some center-based services, and use methods to ensure that families 	<p>Adds requirements that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Within four years, (1) the majority of current Even Start instruction be provided by individuals who have at least an associate's degree in a field related to early childhood education, elementary school education, or adult education or have met State qualifications in those areas and (2) all newly hired instructors have obtained those credentials. ▪ Within four years, administrators receive training in the operation of a family literacy program and paraprofessionals who provide support for academic instruction have a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent. ▪ Instructional programs be based on scientifically based reading research for children and, to the extent possible, for adults. 	<p>Modifies several existing requirements, including the use of research-based instructional services for family literacy and methods to ensure that families</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	successfully complete the program, including providing instructional services during the summer months.		successfully complete the program. (Adds a requirement that instructional programs be based on scientifically based reading research for children, and to the extent such research is available, for adults.)
<u>Local applications to States</u> Requires descriptions of program goals, activities and services, how the program will incorporate the program elements, population to be served, collaborative efforts with other entities, and methods used to ensure that programs will serve families most in need. No comparable language.	Adds requirements that applications also describe outcomes for children and families that: (1) are consistent with the program indicators and strategies; and (2) provide for rigorous and objective evaluation of progress toward the goals and the continuing use of evaluation data for program improvement. Requires that the review panel include an individual with expertise in family literacy programs.	Adds a requirement that applications include a description of how the plan provides for rigorous and objective evaluation of progress toward program objectives and for continuing to use evaluation data for program improvement. Same as Administration's bill.	Same as current law. Same as Administration's bill.
<u>Grant renewal</u> Allows eligible recipients to reapply for additional subgrants. Because of a change made in the FY 2000 appropriations act, no limit on the number of years a project may receive a grant.	A State may provide funding for up to two additional years, beyond the limit of 8 years previously allowed by law, for up to two projects that are highly successful and that have the potential to serve as models for other projects.	Same as current law.	Same as current law.
<u>State program quality indicators</u> Requires States to develop indicators to measure the progress of adult and child participants; specifies requirements for indicators.	Adds requirement that indicators be developed by September 30, 2000 and that the indicators specify intensity and duration of services necessary to achieve desired State outcomes.	Same as current law.	Same as Administration's bill.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Research</u> Requires the Secretary to carry out research into the components of successful family literacy services, and disseminate the results of the research through the National Institute for Literacy.	Deletes these requirements.	Adds requirement that the National Institute for Literacy carry out scientifically based research that focuses on adult literacy in years where the appropriation exceeds that of the previous fiscal year.	Permits the Secretary, in consultation with the National Institute for Literacy and other appropriate organizations, to conduct research on family literacy services. Requires the Secretary to disseminate the results of this research through the National Institute for Literacy and other appropriate means.
<u>Eligibility of Religious Organizations</u> No comparable provision.	No comparable provision.	Ensures that the Secretary considers religious organizations as providers of assistance on the same basis as other non-governmental organizations, so long as the program is implemented in a manner consistent with the establishment clause of the Constitution.	No comparable provision.

Title I, Part C, Education of Migratory Children

<u>Overall Purpose</u> Provides assistance to State educational agencies to establish and improve programs of education for children of migratory farmworkers and fishers that enable them to meet the same high academic standards as other children.	Unchanged.	Unchanged.	Adds the purpose of ensuring that migratory children who move among States are not penalized by disparities among States.
<u>State allocations</u> Establishes a formula for allocating funds to States based on the estimated number of migratory children aged 3 – 21 who reside in the State full time and the full-time	Bases the formula on State counts of the number of eligible children, aged 3 through 21, residing in the State in the previous year, plus the number of those	Maintains current law for fiscal year 2000. For fiscal year 2001 and succeeding fiscal years, uses the formula in the Administration's proposal for the	Maintains current law.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>equivalent of the estimated number of migratory children who reside in the State part time.</p> <p>Limits Puerto Rico's allocations by capping its average per-pupil expenditure at 32 percent of the lowest average per pupil expenditure of any of the 50 states.</p>	<p>children who received services under Part C in summer or intersession programs provided by the State.</p> <p>Establishes a minimum State allocation of the greater of \$200,000 or 80 percent of a State's prior-year allocation. Also, establishes a maximum allocation of 120 percent of a State's prior-year allocation.</p> <p>Phases in changes to eliminate the cap on Puerto Rico's allocation, thus ensuring that Puerto Rico receives Title I allocations on the same basis as the 50 states and D.C. by fiscal year 2005.</p>	<p>allocation of all money above the amount for fiscal year 2000.</p> <p>Replaces the Administration's proposed minimum and maximum allocations with a hold harmless that entitles a State to receive at least the amount it received in fiscal year 2000.</p> <p>Provides partial phase-in of equal treatment for Puerto Rico, but limits it by precluding any resulting reduction of funding to any other State or D.C.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p> <p>Maintains current law.</p>
<p><u>State applications</u></p> <p>Requires States to submit applications for grants under the program, describes the children who are to be given priority for services, and authorizes the provision of services to certain categories of children who are no longer migratory.</p>	<p>Minor technical and conforming changes.</p>	<p>Essentially the same as the Administration's proposal; adds new requirement that applicants address how family literacy services will be offered to migratory parents without a high school diploma or who have a low level of literacy.</p>	<p>Minor technical and conforming amendments.</p>
<p><u>Coordination of migrant education activities</u></p> <p>Authorizes various activities to support the interstate and intrastate coordination of migrant education activities.</p>	<p>Makes for-profit entities eligible for awards.</p>	<p>Maintains current law limiting eligibility to non-profit entities.</p>	<p>Maintains current law limiting eligibility to non-profit entities.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Establishes maximum amount of \$6 million for migrant coordination activities.	Increases the maximum amount that the Secretary may reserve each year to support coordination activities from \$6 million to \$10 million.	Same as Administration's proposal.	Same as Administration's proposal.
	Increases the maximum amount that may be reserved for “incentive grants” from \$1,500,000 to \$3,000,000 and specifies a \$250,000 maximum per grant.	Same as Administration's proposal.	Same as Administration’s proposal.
Requires Secretary to assist States in developing effective methods for the transfer of student records.		Adds requirement that an LEA receiving migrant funds provide records on migrant students to other LEAs at no cost.	
		Requires the General Accounting Office to conduct a study on the feasibility of electronically transferring and maintaining migrant student records.	Requires the Secretary to establish within a year of enactment, a national system for electronic transfer of records on immunization, academic history, results from State assessments, and eligibility for services under IDEA.

Title I, Part D, Neglected and Delinquent

<u>Overall Purpose</u>			<u>In Senate bill this program moves to Title III, Part B</u>
To improve educational services to children in local and State institutions for neglected and delinquent children and	Unchanged except for the deletion of “local” (to conform to deletion of Subpart 2 below).	Maintains current law.	Maintains current law.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
youth so that they have the opportunity to meet challenging State standards that all children are expected to meet.			
<u>State Allocations</u> Limits Puerto Rico's allocations by capping its average per-pupil expenditure at 32 percent at the lowest average per pupil expenditure of any of the 50 states.	Phases in changes to eliminate the cap on Puerto Rico's allocation, thus ensuring that Puerto Rico receives Title I allocations on the same basis as the 50 states and DC by fiscal year 2005.	Phases in changes to decrease, by one half, the gap between what Puerto Rico currently receives and the amount it would receive if treated as a State.	Maintains current law.
<u>Payments for programs under Part D</u> Requires States to retain funds generated throughout the State under Part A of Title I (Basic Grants) on the basis of youth residing in local correctional facilities or attending community day programs for delinquent children and youth, and to use those Part A funds for local programs under Subpart 2 of Part D.	Deletes this requirement and makes other conforming amendments.	Maintains current law.	Maintains current law.
<u>Local agency programs</u> (Subpart 2) Requires each State educational agency to use the funds it reserves (per the requirement noted above) to make grants to LEAs with high proportions of youth in local correctional facilities for drop-out prevention and intervention programs for neglected, delinquent, and other categories of at-risk youth.	Eliminates the Part D Subpart 2 program.	Retains the Part D Subpart 2 program.	Retains the Part D, Subpart 2 program.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Comprehensive School Reform Demonstrations			
<u>Authorization</u> Program created through the Department's FY 1998 appropriations act, which incorporates Section 1002(g)(2) and , by reference, Section 1502 (the Title I general demonstrations authority) and the Conference Report for the Department's FY 1998 appropriation bill.	Program would continue to operate under Title I, Part E (Demonstrations). No separate authorizing language included for CSRD.	Authorizes the program under Title I of ESEA (new Part G).	Authorizes the program under Title I of ESEA (new Part F).
<u>Purpose/Definitions</u> To provide financial incentives for schools, particularly Title I schools, that need to substantially improve student achievement, to implement comprehensive school reform programs that are based on reliable research and effective practices and include an emphasis on basic academics and parent involvement.		Similar except requires that reforms be based on scientifically-based research, which is defined in the bill.	Similar except that it requires that reforms be based upon promising and effective practices and research-based programs.
<u>Distribution of Funds</u> Reserves not more than 1% for the BIA and the Outlying Areas, and not more than 1% for national evaluation. <u>Federal to State</u> Provides funds to States through 2 formulas, with funds appropriated under Title I based on each States' prior-year		Same. Bases formula allocations to States on prior-year Title I Basic Grants. No authority for FIE allocations.	Same. Same as House.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Title I Basic Grants, and funds appropriated under the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) based on the most recent census count of aged 5-17 children or another source.			
<u>State to Local</u> Provides competitive grants to LEAs. SEAs may reserve up to 5% for evaluation, technical assistance, and administration of grants. Establishes a \$50,000 per school grant minimum, renewable for two additional years.		Same.	Same.
<u>State Application</u> Describes SEA process and criteria for selecting competitive grants, SEA plans to ensure that school reform programs are based on rigorous research and meet nine specified criteria, and SEA strategies for disseminating information, providing technical assistance, and evaluating reform implementation.		Similar.	Similar.
<u>Local Application</u> Encourages LEAs to use the funds in schools identified for improvement or corrective action under Title I, Section 1116.		Requires SEAs to give priority to LEAs that would use funds in schools identified for improvement or corrective action under 1116(c).	Same as House.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Evaluation</u> Requires national evaluation, with most evaluation activities occurring in the third year following school reform implementation.		Requires national evaluation after three years of school reform implementation, and an interim report outlining activities to evaluate first-year implementation.	Same as House.

Reading Excellence

<u>Authorization</u> Title II, Part C, as added by FY 1999 appropriations act.	Transfer to Title I (new Part E).	ESEA Title II, Part B.	ESEA Title II, Part C.
<u>SEA Review and Approval of Local Applications</u> No comparable provision.	Requires the State to describe, in its application, the process and criteria that the SEA will use to review and approve applications for Local Reading Improvement and Tutorial Assistance Subgrants, including a peer-review process that includes certain types of experts and, in the case of Tutorial Assistance Subgrants, experts on tutorial assistance.	Same as current law.	Same as current law.
<u>State Administration and Evaluation Funds</u> Allows the SEA to use not more than 5 percent of funds for administrative costs (excluding Tutorial Assistance Subgrants), including not more than 2 percent for State evaluations and performance reports.	Same as current law except includes Tutorial Assistance Subgrants as part of the 5 percent.	Same as current law.	Same as current law.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Allows the SEA to use not more than 15 percent of funds to solicit applications for, award, and oversee the performance of Tutorial Assistance Subgrants. Requires each State to make at least one such subgrant.	Allows the SEA to use not more than 15 percent of funds for Tutorial Assistance Subgrants. (Continues requirement for at least one such subgrant.) These funds must be used only for the subgrant(s), not for the costs of administering them.	Same as current law.	Same as current law.
<u>Eligibility of LEAs to Receive Subgrants and Uses of Funds</u> No comparable provisions.	Limits the eligibility of LEAs that wish to receive Local Reading Improvement and Tutorial Assistance Subgrants to those that have at least one school that serves children in grades 1 through 3.	Same as current law.	Same as current law.

Assistance to Address School Dropout Problems

<u>Authorization</u> Not in current law (although 1994 reauthorization included Dropout Assistance Program in Title V).	Not included.	Not included.	Added as Title I, Part G.
			<u>Purpose</u> To support school dropout prevention and reentry efforts and to raise academic achievement levels.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
			<p><u>National Activities</u></p> <p>Authorizes \$5 million to collect data on program participants, set up an interagency working group focused on school dropout prevention and school reentry, and conduct a national recognition program for schools making “extraordinary progress” in lowering school dropout rates.</p>
			<p><u>National School Dropout Prevention Initiative</u></p> <p>Authorizes a \$125 million program of grants to States to pay startup and implementation costs of effective school dropout prevention and reentry programs at middle or secondary schools with dropout rates in the top third statewide.</p> <p>Requires eligible programs to use research-based strategies that address the entire school population. Allows funds to be used for professional development, curricular materials, remedial education, smaller classes, improving achievement, counseling and mentoring, planning and research, and comprehensive school reform.</p> <p>States would make 3-year awards to schools of \$50,000-\$100,000 in the first year, declining in subsequent years to a minimum of 30 percent of the original amount. Awards could be continued for</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
			an additional two years if significant progress is made in lowering the dropout rate. Grantees could receive a 10 percent bonus increases for projects involving the creation of smaller learning communities.
			<u>Capacity and Design-Building Initiative</u> Authorizes \$20 million for national grants to increase the number of proven models for meeting dropout provision needs of an entire school.

TITLE II – HIGH STANDARDS IN THE CLASSROOM

Professional Development State Grants

<u>Authorization</u>			
Goals 2000, Title III, and ESEA, Title II.	ESEA Title II, Part A.	ESEA Title II, Part A as amended by the Teacher Empowerment Act (H.R. 1995).	ESEA Title II, Part A and Title VI, Part A as amended by the Educational Opportunities Act (S. 2).
<u>Program Focus</u>			
Eisenhower – Supports high-quality professional development for teachers, principals, and other relevant school staff. Goals 2000 – Supports the development of challenging State content and student performance standards and assessments and curricula tied to those standards.	Consolidates the Eisenhower and Goals 2000 programs into a single “Teaching to High Standards” program to support improvement in classroom instruction so that all students are prepared to achieve to challenging State content and student performance standards in the core academic subjects.	Creates a "Teacher Empowerment Act" to improve student achievement through high-quality professional development for teachers and other strategies. Requires districts to spend a portion of their funds on hiring teachers to reduce class size.	Supports State and local efforts to increase student academic achievement and performance by improving teacher quality. Authorizes class size reduction as an allowable activity.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Federal Allocations</u> Eisenhower -- 0.5 percent to outlying areas and 0.5 percent to BIA; formula grants to States based 50 percent on previous year Title I shares and 50 percent on population aged 5 through 17. Goals 2000 – 1 percent total for the outlying areas and BIA; formula grants to States based 50 percent on Title I shares and 50 percent on Title VI shares.	A total of 1 percent to outlying areas and BIA; formula grants to States based 50 percent on previous year's Title I shares and 50 percent on the population aged 5 through 17.	First reserves 0.5 percent for the outlying areas and 0.5 percent for BIA. Holds States harmless at their FY 1999 levels for Eisenhower, Goals 2000, and Class-Size Reduction; additional funds go to States, based 50 percent on the population aged 5 to 17 and 50 percent on the population aged 5 to 17 from families with incomes below the poverty line.	First reserves 0.5 percent for the outlying areas and 0.5 percent for BIA. Holds States harmless at their FY 2000 levels for Eisenhower and Class-Size Reduction; additional funds go to States, based 50 percent on the population aged 5 to 17 and 50 percent on the population aged 5 to 17 from families with incomes below the poverty line.
<u>Priority for Professional Development in Math and Science</u> Eisenhower -- If funding is less than \$250 million, full amount goes to math and science. If funding is \$250 million or greater, the SEA and SAHE, and each LEA, must in total spend for professional development in math and science an amount that is at least as much as the allocation the State would have received if the appropriation had been \$250 million.	If funding is \$300 million or less, full amount goes to math and science. If funding is greater than \$300 million, the SEA and SAHE must jointly ensure that the total amount of funds they and their subgrantees use for professional development in math and science is at least as much as the allocation the State would have received if the appropriation had been \$300 million.	Requires LEAs to maintain their effort for professional development in math and science at that of the fiscal year preceding enactment of the Teacher Empowerment Act, but provides for waivers.	Requires LEAs to use a portion of their funds for professional development activities in mathematics and science.
<u>State Application</u> Eisenhower – Must describe, among other things, how the State plans to provide teachers and other appropriate staff the	Must describe, among other things, how the State will use program funds to support the alignment of curricula, assessments,	Must include, among other things, a plan to ensure that all teachers in the State are fully qualified by December 31, 2003; an	Similar to House.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>knowledge and skills needed to help all children reach State content and student performance standards.</p> <p>Goals 2000 – Must describe the State’s plan for improving elementary and secondary education within the State.</p>	<p>and professional development with challenging State and local content and student performance standards.</p>	<p>LEA and school to report on its annual assurance that the State will require each LEA and school to report on its annual progress against performance indicators that measure student academic achievement, closing the achievement gaps between students by minority and non-minority status and by low-income and non-low-income status, and the percentage of classes in core academic areas taught by fully qualified teachers. Requires the Secretary to approve an application unless he or she makes a written determination, within 90 days after receiving the application, that it is in violation of the provisions of the law.</p>	
<p><u>Within-State Allocations</u></p> <p>Eisenhower -- The SAHE receives 16 percent of the State's allocation, of which up to 5 percent may be used for administration. The SEA receives 84 percent of the State's allocation, of which up to 5 percent may be used for State-level activities and 5 percent for administration. Remaining SEA funds are allocated to LEAs 50 percent on preceding year’s Title I shares and 50 percent on enrollment of students in public and private schools.</p>	<p>The SEA must make available to the SAHE an amount equal to what the State's allocation would be if the amount appropriated for this program were \$60 million. (The SAHE may reserve up to 3.3 percent of these funds for administration). The SEA may reserve up to 10 percent for State-level activities and administration, of which no more than a third may be used for administration. Remaining funds go to LEAs, with 50 percent allocated based on the number of children aged 5 through 17 living in poverty and 50 percent awarded competitively to LEAs based on need and the quality of applications.</p>	<p>Allows the State to reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for State-level activities, of which 5 percent may be used for planning and administration. Of the remaining amount, the State awards 80 percent of the funds to LEAs by formula, based 50 percent on enrollment and 50 percent on the population aged 5 to 17 from families in poverty, and awards 20 percent competitively. Holds LEAs harmless at FY 1999 levels; States would be required to use competitive-grant funds to cover any differences. Requires States to provide at least 3 percent of the competitive-grant funds to the SAHE</p>	<p>State may reserve 10 percent for State-level activities, of which 5 percent may be used for planning and administration. Of the remainder, the State awards 95 percent of the funds to LEAs by formula, based 25 percent on enrollment and 75 percent on the population aged 5 to 17 from poor families, and 5 percent of the funds go to the SAHE for competitive awards to partnerships to provide professional development.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Goals 2000 – States award at least 90 percent of their funds competitively to districts, with at least half of the funds for subgrants for local reform and professional development going to LEAs with a percentage or number of poor children exceeding the statewide average.		for partnerships to provide professional development (see below).	
<p><u>State-Level Activities</u></p> <p>Eisenhower – State activities to improve teacher licensure, teacher assessments, and professional development.</p> <p>Goals 2000 – State activities to establish academic standards and coordinate curriculum frameworks, assessments, teacher preparation and licensure requirements, and other aspects of the educational system.</p>	Activities to support, among other things, continued revision and improvement of State content and student performance standards and assessments aligned with those standards; redesign of professional licensure.	Activities to support, among other things, reforming teacher certification, recertification, or licensure requirements; providing mentoring for beginning teachers; establishing, expanding, or improving alternative routes to certification, especially in the areas of math and science, for highly qualified individuals with a baccalaureate degree; developing mechanisms to help LEAs recruit and retain teachers and principals; reforming tenure systems and implementing teacher testing to remove incompetent teachers; providing technical assistance to LEAs; and promoting reciprocity of teacher certification between or among States.	Similar to House.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Subgrants to IHE-LEA Partnerships</u> No partnership requirements.	Requires IHEs to enter into a written agreement with at least one LEA to be eligible to receive a subgrant (under the set-aside described above). In awarding subgrants, the SAHE must give priority to projects that focus on induction for new teachers.	Requires the SAHE, working in conjunction with the SEA, to award competitive grants to eligible partnerships, which must include a high-need LEA, a school of arts and sciences, and an institution that prepares teachers, and may include other entities. No participant in a partnership may retain more than 50 percent of the funds. Grant recipients must use funds for professional development activities in the core academic subjects and for ensuring that LEAs and schools are able to use State content and performance standards and assessments to improve instruction and student achievement.	Similar to House bill.
<u>Competitive Subgrants to LEAs</u> Eisenhower – No comparable provision. Goals 2000 – States award funds competitively to districts. At least half of the funds must go to LEAs that have a greater percentage or number of disadvantaged children than the statewide average.	Requires the SEA to award subgrants competitively on the basis of need and the quality of the applications, after providing LEAs with the “greatest need” a reasonable opportunity to compete for an award. After a competition, the SEA must provide technical assistance to those LEAs identified as having the greatest need but that competed unsuccessfully for a subgrant.	No comparable provision.	No comparable provision.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p><u>Local Applications</u></p> <p>Eisenhower – Applications must include, among other things, an assessment of local needs for professional development as identified by the LEA and school staff.</p> <p>Goals 2000 -- Applications must include a local improvement plan that addresses districtwide education improvement designed to enable all children to achieve to State content and student performance standards.</p>	<p>LEA applications must include, among other things, a district-wide plan that addresses how program funds will be used to: support the alignment of curricula, assessments, and professional development with challenging State and local standards; provide professional development in the core academic subjects; assist new teachers during their first three years in the classroom; and ensure that teachers are proficient in content knowledge and teaching skills.</p>	<p>LEA applications must include, among other things, a description of how the LEA will use program funds, including an assurance that the LEA will target funds to schools that have the lowest proportion of fully qualified teachers, have the largest average class size, or are identified for Title I school improvement.</p>	<p>Similar to House, but omits requirement that the LEA assure targeting of funds to schools that have the largest average class size. Also requires a description of how program activities relate to research and why the activities are expected to improve student performance and outcomes.</p>
<p><u>LEA Uses of Funds</u></p> <p>Eisenhower – Professional development activities that are tied to the LEA plan, with at least 80 percent of funds for school-level professional development. The remaining funds can be used for district-wide professional development.</p> <p>Goals 2000 – LEA reform activities, such as developing curricula or providing professional development that are tied to State standards.</p>	<p>Permits professional development activities in the core academic subjects that are intensive, sustained, and collaborative. Such activities may include, for example, teacher study groups, teacher networks, classroom observation, internships, and mentoring. Also authorizes development and distribution of school and LEA report cards (as required under the proposed Title XI).</p>	<p>Requires LEAs to use program funds for professional development in math and science (see above), professional development in other subject areas, and hiring and retaining teachers to reduce class size. An LEA may apply to the State for a waiver to use the funds for activities other than providing professional development in math and science or for reducing class size. Also allows LEAs to use program funds for a variety of activities, including signing bonuses for teachers to teach in academic subjects in which there is a shortage of fully qualified teachers, providing alternative routes to</p>	<p>Requires LEAs to use a portion of program funds for professional development in mathematics and science and professional development to help educators help students meet challenging content and performance standards. Allows LEAs to use program funds for a variety of activities, which are similar to those listed in the House bill.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		certification, mentoring programs, and providing financial incentives to teachers who have a record of success in helping low-achieving students to improve, tenure reform, merit pay, testing programs for teachers.	
<u>Program Performance Indicators</u> Eisenhower – Requires States to report to the Secretary on their progress on program performance indicators every three years and LEAs to report progress to the State.	Requires the Secretary to develop program performance indicators, in collaboration with States, LEAs, and IHEs, three months after the effective date of the legislation. Recipients of funds are required to report on their progress against these indicators.	Requires LEAs and schools to report on performance indicators that measure student academic achievement, closing the achievement gaps between students by minority and non-minority status and by low-income and non-low-income status, and the percentage of classes in core academic areas taught by fully qualified teachers.	Requires LEAs to report on performance indicators that measure student academic achievement, closing the achievement gaps between students by minority and non-minority status and by low-income and non-low-income status, and other indicators for professional development.
<u>National Programs</u> Eisenhower – Authorizes the Secretary to support activities of national significance that the Secretary determines will contribute to the development and implementation of high-quality professional development activities in the core academic subjects, including support for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Requires the National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education.	Continues the current Eisenhower authority, but expands it to include activities of national significance that contribute to the improvement of teaching and school leadership and to the recruitment and retention of teachers and principals in high-poverty LEAs.	Replaces the current broad authority for activities of national significance with discrete categorical authorities. Authorizes competitive grants to consortia to promote alternative routes to teacher certification (teacher excellence academies); continuation of the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education; an award for a National Clearinghouse for Teacher Entrepreneurship; and grants to	Similar to House bill, except continues support for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards through 2001. Also adds competitive grants for teacher training programs in mathematics and science.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	Authorizes professional development for school leaders under Title II National Activities.	<p>rural LEAs to recruit and prepare teachers. Requires competitive grants to partnerships of IHEs and LEAs for the professional development of principals. Eliminates language relating to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.</p> <p>Creates a separate “Professional Development for Principals as Leaders of School Reform” program for principals and other school administrators.</p>	Creates, as a separate Part B, a “Leadership Education and Development Program” that is similar to the House program.

Title II, Part B, Transition to Teaching: Troops to Teachers

<u>Purpose</u>			
No comparable ESEA program.	Amends ESEA to expand the Department of Defense’s Troops to Teachers model to help high-poverty school districts find highly qualified teachers in particular highly qualified teachers in particular subject areas, such as mathematics, science, foreign languages, bilingual education, and special education.	Same as the Administration’s bill, except that Troops to Teachers and Transition to Teaching would be separate programs.	Continues the Troops to Teachers program; does not authorize a separate or broader Transition to Teaching program.
<u>Program Authorized</u>	Requires the Secretary, before making competitive awards, to transfer funds to DoD for continuation of the Troops to Teachers program. Authorizes the Secretary to use remaining funds to award competitive grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to institutions of	Same as the Administration’s bill, except that the Secretary would not have to transfer program funds to DoD for the Troops to Teachers program before making awards under the Transition program. Also requires DOD and DOT to cover 25% of the costs of the program.	Requires the Secretary to transfer funds to the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES) at DoD for the continuation of the Troops to Teachers program, including the selection of program participants. Permits the Secretary to retain a portion of program

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	Higher education or other entities to recruit, prepare, place and support career-changing professionals who wish to become teachers. Grantees may provide training stipends and other financial incentives for program participants, which may not exceed \$5,000 for each participant.		funds to identify LEAs with teacher shortages and States with alternative certification requirements. Requires the administering Secretary to pay each participant a stipend of \$5,000.
<u>Period of Service for Program Participants</u>	Requires program participants who complete training to serve for at least three years in a school district with a poverty rate of at least 20 percent or a total number of poor children exceeding 10,000. Requires the Secretary to establish a repayment system for participants who receive a training stipend or other financial incentive but fail to complete their service obligation.	Same as the Administration's bill, except that program participants under the Transition program would be required to serve for at least three years in a school district that serves an elementary or secondary school in an area where there is a high percentage of individuals from families with incomes below the poverty line (definition of "high-need local educational agency" is different in the two bills).	Allows the administering Secretary to pay a bonus of \$10,000 to each participant in lieu of a stipend if the participant agrees to teach in a high-need school for at least 4 years. Requires participants to pay back their stipends or bonuses if they do not serve as an elementary or secondary school teacher or vocational/technical teacher for at least 4 years. (Bonus recipients must teach in a high-need school for 4 years).

Title II, Part C, Early Childhood Educator Professional Development

<u>Purpose</u>			
No comparable program.	To improve the knowledge and skills of early childhood educators who work in high-poverty areas.	No comparable program.	No comparable program.
	<u>Program Authorized</u> Authorizes competitive awards to partnerships of: (1) IHEs or private,		

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	<p>nonprofit organizations that provide professional development; and (2) public or private nonprofit agencies. Priority for partnerships that include LEAs that operate early childhood programs for children from low-income families in high-need communities.</p> <p>Grants for up to 4 years; may not be renewed. Requires applicants to provide descriptions of the community served and the proposed program. Requires annual reports from grantees to measure progress against performance indicators announced by the Secretary.</p>		
	<p><u>Uses of Funds</u></p> <p>Activities to improve the knowledge and skills of early childhood educators who work in high-need, high-poverty areas, and support them during their first three years in the field, including: professional development to familiarize them with recent research on child, language, and literacy development; professional development activities for educators who work with children who have limited English proficiency, disabilities, and other special needs.</p>		
	<p><u>Cost-Sharing</u></p> <p>Federal share is not more than 50 percent of the total cost of the project and not more than 80 percent in any single year.</p>		

Title II, Part D, Technical Assistance Programs

<p><u>Common Requirements for All Technical Assistance Programs</u></p> <p>None.</p>	<p>Supports a national, comprehensive, and integrated system of technical assistance and information dissemination. Requires all of the programs listed below, as well as the Regional Technology in Education Consortia authorized under ESEA Title III and the educational laboratories and ERIC clearinghouses authorized under the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act, to participate in a technical assistance network.</p>	<p>No comparable provisions.</p>	<p>No comparable provisions.</p>
<p><u>Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers</u></p> <p>Authorizes 15 regional centers to provide comprehensive technical assistance to help States, schools, districts, and tribes enable all students, particularly those who are poor, limited English proficient, migratory, or American Indian, to attain high academic standards.</p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p><u>Strengthening the Capacity of State and Local Educational Agencies to Become Effective, Informed Consumers of Technical Assistance</u></p> <p>Authorizes a program of formula grants to States and the 100 LEAs with the largest number of children in poverty to identify their needs for technical assistance in implementing ESEA programs and in implementing comprehensive standards-based education reform, select high-quality technical assistance services, and build their capacity for school improvement. Requires the Secretary to provide States and districts with consumer information to help them identify and choose among various sources and types of technical assistance.</p>	<p>No provisions to reauthorize technical assistance activities.</p>	<p>Same as current law.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Comparable activities are authorized under the Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers.	<u>Technical Assistance Centers Serving Special Needs</u> Authorizes two new technical assistance centers dedicated to improving teaching and learning for limited English proficient, migratory, Indian, and Alaska Native students.	No comparable provision.	No comparable provision.
<u>Parental Information Resource Centers (PIRCs)</u> Provide parents with training, information, and support in better understanding their children's educational needs and how to help their children achieve to high academic standards. The PIRCs are currently authorized under Title IV of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.	Reauthorizes the PIRCs with a shift in emphasis from providing direct assistance to parents, to providing technical assistance to States, LEAs, schools, and organizations that serve parents.	No provisions to reauthorize technical assistance activities.	Reauthorizes the Parental Information Centers under Title I of the ESEA (new Part D) but removes requirement that centers serve parents of preschool children. Extends services to SEAs, LEAs, schools, and organizations that support family-school partnerships.
<u>Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia</u> Authorizes 10 regional consortia to provide States and school districts with technical assistance to improve math and science education.	Reauthorizes the Eisenhower Regional Consortia. Eliminates the requirement for a National Panel to make recommendations for awards. Streamlines the authority by deleting unnecessary definitions and other language.	No action as of 5/2000.	Repeals the authority, but allows regional entities such as the consortia to receive Regional Technical Support and Professional Development Grants.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p><u>Technology-Based Technical Assistance Information Dissemination</u></p> <p>Authorizes the Secretary to provide a technology-based technical assistance service that supports the administration and implementation of ESEA programs by providing information, including legal and regulatory information, and technical guidance and information about best practices, and that is accessible to all ESEA funding recipients. However, the statute does not provide an authorization of funds for this activity.</p>	<p>Authorizes appropriations for a national system, through the Worldwide Web and other advanced telecommunications technologies, that supports interactive information sharing among teachers, administrators, parents, and students and disseminates information about ways to improve educational practices throughout the Nation.</p>	<p>No comparable provisions.</p>	<p>No comparable provisions.</p>

Title II, Part F, Digital Education Content Collaborative

<p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>Creates new Digital Education Content Collaborative program to develop, produce, and distribute educational material and instructional video programs designed for use by K-12 schools and based on State standards. Authorizes 3-year grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements. Requires 100 percent non-Federal match.</p>
---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

TITLE III – TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATION

Title III, Part A, Federal Leadership and National Activities

<p>Provides that, when the appropriation for Title III, Part A, subparts 1, 2, and 3 is less than \$75 million, \$3 million is to be set aside for National Activities and \$10</p>	<p>Provides a separate authorization of appropriations for Federal Leadership, Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, Next Generation Technology Innovation,</p>	<p>Authorizes 95 percent of the funds for a State formula grant program and 5 percent for national technology initiatives.</p>	<p>Authorizes \$5 million for National Programs for Technology in Education and \$10 million for the Regional Technical Support and Professional Development</p>
---	---	--	--

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
million for the Regional Technical Support and Professional Development program, and the remainder is for a competitive grant program. When the appropriation for Title III Part A, subparts 1, 2, and 3 is \$75 million or greater, \$5 million is to be set aside for National Activities, \$10 million for Regional Technical Support and Professional Development program, and the remainder for a State formula program and continuation costs for the competitive grant program.	and Regional Technology Support and Professional Development programs.		program in fiscal year 2001. In the four succeeding fiscal years, authorizes not more than 2.5 percent for National Programs for Technology in Education and the Regional Technical Support and Professional Development program. Requires that 70 percent of the remaining funds go for a State formula grant program and 30 percent for a competitive grant program.
Authorizes the Secretary to carry out activities to provide Federal leadership in promoting the use of technology in education. Requires the Secretary to develop a national long-range technology plan.	Similar to current law. Requires the Secretary to develop a strategy for an ongoing evaluation of existing and anticipated future uses of educational technology. Also requires the Secretary to update the national technology plan and to develop a strategy for promoting the full integration of technology into learning, opportunities for teachers to develop networks, and the commercial development of effective technology.	Authorizes the Secretary to: (1) fund programs that utilize technology in education; (2) provide technical assistance to grantees; and (3) update the national long-range technology plan. Requires the Secretary to: (1) conduct an independent study on the effectiveness of educational technology in improving student achievement; (2) develop tools and provide resources to grantees of technology program funds; and (3) conduct independent evaluations of the programs funded.	Similar to current law. Requires the Secretary to update the national long-range technology plan.

Title III, Part B, Special Projects

Technology Innovation Challenge Grants (TICG) and Star Schools <u>Purpose</u> To support projects that develop innovative uses of technology to improve teaching and learning.	<u>Next Generation Technology Innovation Awards</u> (Incorporates Technology Innovation Challenge Grants (TICG) and Star Schools) Consolidates Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and Star Schools into a single authority to expand knowledge	Repeals TICG and Star Schools programs. However, the Secretary may, from the 5% national set-aside, fund programs that use	TICG: Same as current law. Renames the program the National Technology Innovation Grants program.
---	--	--	---

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>technology; (2) directly benefit students; (3) ensure ongoing, sustained professional development for educators; (4) ensure the sustainable use of technologies acquired with program funds; and (5) can demonstrate that consortium members will provide substantial contributions.</p> <p>Star Schools: Priority for projects that: (1) are aligned with the National Education Goals or State standards; (2) provide services to programs serving adults, (3) serve schools with significant numbers of children counted for Title I, (4) serve a broad range of programs and institutions and provide a broad range of services; and (5) involve a telecommunications entity.</p>	<p>technology, projects that serve more than one State and involve large-scale innovations in the use of technology in education, projects that develop models for underserved populations, projects in which applicants provide substantial resources, and projects that develop innovative models for using electronic networks to provide challenging courses.</p>		<p>Star Schools: Same as current law.</p>
<p><u>Ready-to-Learn Television</u></p> <p>Authorizes grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements for the development and distribution of educational video for preschool and elementary school children and their parents. Eligibility for this purpose is limited to nonprofit entities with a demonstrated capacity to develop and distribute educational television programming for children and a</p>	<p><u>Ready-to-Learn Digital Television</u></p> <p>Continues current program.</p>	<p>Continues current program but deletes the separate authority for Special Projects of National Significance and deletes the requirement that programming reflect diverse cultural experiences.</p>	<p>Similar to current law but adds a requirement for the development of digital content and distribution via the Internet.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>demonstrated capacity to contract with producers of children’s programming.</p> <p>Also authorizes Special Projects of National Significance, the establishment of a clearinghouse to increase access to Ready-to-Learn programs and projects, and the development and dissemination of training materials for parents and adults who work with young children.</p>		<p>Requires that grantees have the capacity to negotiate contracts that enable them to receive a share of income from the sale of products produced under the program and to contract with producers of children’s television programming to produce programs accessible by a large majority of disadvantaged preschool and elementary school children.</p>	<p>Deletes requirement that 10 percent of funds be spent on identifying, supporting, and enhancing innovative school readiness programs.</p>
<p><u>Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics</u></p> <p>Authorizes a national telecommunications-based demonstration project to improve the teaching of mathematics.</p> <p>Requires applicant to use existing publicly funded telecommunications infrastructure to deliver video, voice, and data.</p>	<p><u>Telecommunications Program for Professional Development in the Core Content Areas</u></p> <p>Expands the authorization to the core content areas.</p> <p>Requires the applicant to use the public broadcasting infrastructure, digital libraries, and school networks to deliver video and web-based resources.</p>	<p>Authorizes: (1) a national telecommunications-based demonstration project similar to the current program but expands the authorization to the core academic subjects; and (2) grants to local telecommunications entities to produce programming aligned or adaptable to State content standards for elementary and secondary students.</p> <p>Modifies current law to also require the use of the Internet and school digital networks (where available).</p>	<p>Reauthorizes the program as the New Century Program for Distributed Teacher Professional Development under Title II (new Part E) and extends the authorization to the core content areas.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Community Technology Centers</u>	<u>Program Authorized</u>		
No separate authorization; funded under the National Activities authority.	Establishes separate program authorization to create or expand community technology centers in high-poverty urban and rural communities and to provide technical assistance to such centers.	No comparable program.	No comparable program.
	<u>Eligible Applicants</u>		
	SEAs, LEAs, community-based organizations, IHEs, for-profit businesses, public or private nonprofit organizations, or a consortium of such entities, that have the capacity to expand access to computers and related services in eligible communities.		
	<u>Uses of Funds</u>		
	Funds may be used to, among others: (1) pay for a coordinator and staff; (2) acquire equipment and infrastructure; (3) provide after-school, adult education and family literacy, career development, and small business activities; and (4) provide home access to computers and technology.		

Title III, Part C, Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology

No separate authorization; currently funded under the National Activities authority.	<u>Program authorized</u>		
	Separate program authorization to prepare prospective teachers to use advanced technology to create learning environments conducive to preparing all students to achieve to high standards.	No comparable program.	No comparable program. Authorizes continuation awards to be made under National Technology Innovation Grants program.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	<p><u>Eligible Applicants</u></p> <p>A consortium that includes at least one IHE that prepares individuals for entry into teaching, an SEA or an LEA, and one or more appropriate entities.</p>		
	<p><u>Uses of Funds</u></p> <p>Funds <u>must</u> be used for: (1) programs that prepare prospective teachers to use advanced technology to create learning environments conducive to preparing all students to achieve to high standards and (2) evaluating project effectiveness. Funds may also be used to, among others: (1) develop alternative teacher development paths, (2) develop standards and assessments to measure the capacity of prospective teachers to use technology effectively, (3) provide technical assistance and disseminate information to other teacher preparation programs, and (4) acquire equipment and infrastructure. The Federal share of the cost of any project may not exceed 50 percent. Projects may use not more than 10 percent of their funds to acquire equipment and infrastructure. The non-Federal share of any such purchase must be in cash.</p>		

Title III, Part D, Regional, State, and Local Educational Technology Resources

<p><u>Technology Literacy Challenge Fund</u></p> <p><u>Purpose</u></p> <p>No specific purpose for the State formula grant program. The purpose of Title III is to support a comprehensive system for the acquisition and use of technology and technology-enhanced curricula, instruction, and administrative support resources and services to improve the delivery of educational services.</p>	<p>To increase the capacity of States and LEAs to improve student achievement, particularly in high-poverty, low-performing schools, by supporting State and local efforts that: (1) make effective use of new technologies and technology applications, networks, and electronic learning resources; (2) utilize research-based teaching practices that are linked to advanced technologies; and (3) promote sustained and intensive, high-quality professional development.</p>	<p>No specific purpose for the State formula grant program. The purpose of Title III is to: (1) assist States and localities to implement innovative technology initiatives; (2) encourage initiatives to increase access to technology in high-need LEAs; (3) promote the effective use of technology by teachers and administrators; (4) support the development of electronic networks; (5) support the evaluation of programs; and (6) promote parental involvement.</p>	<p>Same as current law. Renames program as the Technology Literacy Fund.</p>
<p><u>Distribution of Funds</u></p> <p><u>Federal to State</u></p> <p>State allocations are based on each State’s share of Title I, Part A and no State may receive less than one-half of 1 percent of the amount appropriated.</p>	<p>Same as current law, but makes technical change that reserves a total of one-half of 1 percent for the Outlying Areas.</p>	<p>Reserves not more than .305 percent or \$2.125 million, whichever is greater for the BIA. Reserves not more than .305 percent or \$2.125 million, whichever is greater for the Outlying Areas. State allocations are based one half on each State’s share of Title I, Part A and one half on each State’s share of school-age population.</p>	<p>Same as current law, but makes technical change that reserves a total of one-half of 1 percent for the Outlying Areas.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p><u>State to Local</u></p> <p>At least 95 percent of State allocation is used for competitive awards to LEAs.</p> <p>Requires States to provide technical assistance in preparing an application to LEAs identified as having the highest number or percentage of poor children and demonstrate the greatest need for technical assistance.</p>	<p>No major change except that a State may use up to 2 percent of the amount available for local awards to provide planning subgrants to LEAs to help them develop the local technology plans required to apply for program funds.</p> <p>Requires States to give a priority to partnerships that include at least one LEA that is among LEAs in the State with the highest numbers or percentages of poor children and includes one or more low-performing schools.</p> <p>Same as current law, with the additional requirements that SEAs assist the identified LEAs to form partnerships to apply for program funds and to establish performance indicators and methods for measuring program outcomes against the indicators.</p>	<p>At least 95 percent of State allocation is distributed to LEAs. Of the amount available for distribution to LEAs, States must distribute at least 80 percent by formula and award not more than 20 percent competitively.</p> <p>No comparable provision.</p> <p>Requires that formula used by the State to target funds to high-need LEAs. Stipulates that competitive awards can be made only to “eligible local entities” (defined as a “high need LEA” or partnership that includes at least one high need LEA and an entity with expertise in the application of technology).</p>	<p>Same as current law.</p> <p>No comparable provision.</p> <p>Same as current law.</p>
<p><u>State Application</u></p> <p>Application includes a statewide technology plan that includes: (1) long-term strategies for financing technology in the State, including a description of how business, industry, and other public and private agencies can participate in the planning, implementation, and support of the plan; and (2) how the State will provide assistance to LEAs the have the</p>	<p>Application is to include a new or updated statewide educational technology plan that is coordinated with and supports the State plan for comprehensive standards-based education reform. Also sets forth nine elements for the plan.</p>	<p>Application is to include a new or updated statewide educational technology plan. Also set forth six elements for the plan. Stipulates that a State plan is approved unless the Secretary notifies the State in writing within 90 days of the submission of the plan that the plan does not meet the statutory requirements.</p>	<p>Same as current law with added requirement that each State describes its goals for using advanced technologies to improve student achievement.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
highest percentage or number of poor children and demonstrate the greatest need for technology to implement their local technology plans.			
<u>Local Use of Funds</u> Authorizes LEAs to use program funds to: (1) develop, adapt, or expand applications of educational technology; (2) fund projects to improve student learning; (3) acquire Internet connections and purchase hardware and software; (4) provide professional development; (5) implement wide area networks; and (6) provide educational services for parents and families.	Authorizes eight uses of funds that include: (1) adapting or expanding existing applications of technology; (2) providing professional development to enable teachers to integrate technology into curriculum; and (3) assisting schools to use technology to promote parent and family involvement.	Requires grantees to use at least 20 percent of their awards for professional development in the integration of advanced technologies. Authorizes 9 additional uses of funds that include: (1) adapting or expanding existing applications of technology; (2) acquiring filtering or blocking technologies; (3) implementing performance measurement systems; and (4) expanding access to technology in high-need LEAs.	Expands authorization of uses of funds to include activities to prepare teachers to use technology effectively and to enhance parental involvement.
<u>Local Applications</u> Requires a local technology plan that includes descriptions of how the LEA will: (1) involve the general public in the plan's development, (2) use technology to promote equity in education and provide access to best teaching practices and curriculum resources; and (3) evaluate technologies acquired with program funds.	Adds requirements to describe: (1) how program funds would benefit low-performing schools; (2) how the applicant would ensure that technology is available to, and usable by, all students; and (3) if the applicant is a partnership, a description of that partnership.	Adds requirement that the local educational technology plan be consistent with the objectives of the statewide educational technology plan. Application must also include eight specific descriptions	Similar to current law.
<u>Regional Technology in Education Consortia</u> <u>Program Authorized</u> Authorizes grants to regional consortia that must include SEAs, IHEs, and nonprofit organizations, or a combination thereof.	Also authorizes contracts and cooperative agreements.	No comparable program, but technical assistance could be funded under National Technology Initiatives.	Same as current law, except adds requirement for current grantees to report on activities three months after enactment.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>Consortia provide professional development designed to prepare teachers to help all students learn through the use of technology. Consortia may also develop training resources for elementary, secondary, and adult education; provide referrals to other sources of technical assistance and professional development; and help IHEs establish programs that prepare teachers to use educational technology in their classrooms.</p> <p>Consortia collaborate with SEAs and LEAs in helping schools that serve large numbers of disadvantaged students with limited access to technology.</p>	<p>In addition, grantees must meet the general provisions relating to technical assistance providers contained in the proposed Title II, subpart 2.</p> <p>Requires grantees to maintain, or contribute to, a national repository on the effective uses of educational technology.</p>		<p>Same as current law.</p> <p>Same as current law.</p>

Title III, Part E -- Advanced Placement

<p><u>Advanced Placement Program Grants</u></p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>Authorizes three-year competitive Advanced Placement Program Grants to State and local educational agencies to expand access for low-income individuals to advanced placement programs. Authorized activities include teacher training, preadvanced placement course development, curriculum development.</p>
<p><u>On-Line Advanced Placement Courses</u></p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>No comparable provision</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>Authorizes competitive grants to State educational agencies to make subgrants to</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p><u>Advanced Placement Incentive Program</u></p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>provide students with on-line advanced placement courses. Funds may also be used to train teachers</p> <p>Moves the authorization for the current Advanced Placement Incentives Program to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This program is currently authorized by 1998 amendments to Title VIII, Part B of the Higher Education Act.</p>

TITLE IV – SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

<p><u>Before- and After-School Programs</u></p> <p>Authorizes separate categorical programs for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, and for 21st Century Community Learning Centers.</p>	<p>Similar to current law.</p>	<p>Would consolidate the activities of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program (currently in ESEA Title X-I) with the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grant program, and authorize the Secretary to fund continuation awards to 21st Century Learning Centers grantees out of the appropriation for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs.</p>	<p>Similar to current law.</p>
<p><u>Distribution of Funds</u></p> <p>Includes separate authorizations for State Grants and National Programs. State</p>	<p>Includes separate authorizations for State Grants, National Programs, and Project</p>	<p>Includes separate authorizations for State Grants and National Programs. However,</p>	<p>Includes separate authorizations for State Grants, National Programs, and a National</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>Grants are allocated half on the basis of school-aged population and half on the basis of State shares of Title I funding. Governors receive 20 percent, and SEAs 80 percent, of each State’s allocation.</p> <p><u>SEAs</u> are required to subgrant at least 91 percent of their allocations by formula to LEAs; these subgrants are based on enrollment (70 percent) and “greatest need” (30 percent). All LEAs are eligible for funding based on enrollment. SEAs determine the criteria for selecting greatest need LEAs and are required to target their greatest need funds on no more than 10 percent or up 5 of their LEAs, whichever is greater. SEAs may retain up to 5 percent of their allocations for State-level program activities, which may include training and technical assistance to LEAs, and may retain (in addition) up to 4 percent for administration.</p>	<p>SERV. State Grants would be allocated on the same basis as in current law.</p> <p><u>SEAs</u> would be required to award at least 70 percent of their allocations competitively to LEAs based on objective measures of need and on the quality of the LEA’s proposed programming, in sufficient amounts to support effective programming. SEAs would be required to make such awards to 50 percent or fewer of the LEAs in the State, unless the State can demonstrate that the SEA can fund more than 50 percent of its LEAs and still make awards of sufficient size to support effective programming. In addition, SEAs would be permitted to use up to 10 percent of their allocations for non-competitive awards to LEAs with the greatest need for assistance that do not receive a competitive award.</p>	<p>would limit the authorization for National Programs to \$20 million. State Grant funds would be allocated to States on the same basis as in current law, but within States, Governors would be capped at 10 percent, and SEAs could receive up to 100 percent, of each State’s allocation.</p> <p><u>SEAs</u> would be required to subgrant at least 96 percent of their allocations by formula to LEAs; as in current law, these subgrants would be based on enrollment (70 percent) and “greatest need” (30 percent). All LEAs would continue to be eligible for funding based on enrollment and SEAs would continue to determine the criteria for selecting greatest need funding, as in current law; however, SEAs would no longer be required to target their greatest need funds on a limited number of LEAs. In awarding greatest need funds, SEAs would be required to (1) distribute a portion to LEAs that need assistance in providing alternative education programs, with priority to programs that serve students who have been suspended or expelled from school; and (2) give special consideration to LEAs that include mental health services in their programs. SEAs may retain up to 2 percent of their allocations for State-level program activities designed to support the implementation of LEA drug and violence prevention programs, including before-and</p>	<p>Coordinator Initiative. Would not permit increases in funding for National Programs in any fiscal year in which funding for State Grants is not increased by at least 10 percent over the previous fiscal year. State Grants would be allocated on the same basis as in current law.</p> <p><u>SEAs</u> would be required to subgrant at least 91 percent of their allocations to LEAs, the same proportion as in current law. However, SEAs could subgrant these funds to LEAs on almost any basis they choose – all or partly based on enrollment; up to 30 percent to any LEAs the SEA determines (for any reason) have a need for additional funds; and up to 70 percent on any basis to LEAs that the SEA determines, through a competitive process and based on criteria established by the SEA, have the greatest need for funds to carry out drug and violence prevention programs. SEAs may retain up to 5 percent of their allocations for State-level program activities, and up to 5 percent for administration (provided that they do not retain, in total, more than 9 percent at their State grant allocations).</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		after-school programs and continuing education activities; and may retain (in addition) up to 2 percent for administration.	
<p><u>Governors</u> may retain up to 5 percent of their allocations for administration; and are required to award at least 20 percent of their allocations competitively to law enforcement agencies in consortium with LEAs or community-based organizations, and at least 85 percent of their allocations competitively to public entities and private nonprofit organizations, and in doing so, must give priority to programs and activities for: (a) children and youth who are not normally served by SEAs and LEAs, and (b) populations that need special services or additional resources.</p> <p>No similar provisions.</p>	<p><u>Governors</u> would be required to award at least 80 percent of their allocations competitively to public entities and private nonprofit organizations to support community efforts that directly complement the efforts of LEAs to foster drug-free, safe, and orderly learning environments in and around schools.</p> <p><u>SEAs and Governors</u> would each be required to use at least 10 percent (but not more than 20 percent) of their allocations for jointly administered State-level program activities that include planning, developing, and implementing capacity building, technical assistance, and accountability services to support the effective implementation, accountability, and improvement of local drug and violence prevention activities throughout the State. Within this 20 percent cap, the SEA and Governor may provide emergency intervention services to schools and communities following a traumatic</p>	<p><u>Governors</u> may retain up to 3 percent of their allocations for administration; are required to award at least 10 percent (but not more than 20 percent) of their allocations competitively to law enforcement education partnerships; and must award the remainder of their allocations competitively, consistent with current law.</p> <p>No similar provisions.</p>	<p><u>Governors</u> – same as current law, but drops the required 10 percent set-aside for law enforcement education partnerships, and in its place, explicitly authorizes Governors to use their 5 percent set-aside for program administration to award grants to law enforcement agencies.</p> <p>No similar provisions.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	crisis, such as a shooting, major accident, or drug-related incident that has disrupted the learning environment. Also within the 20 percent cap (but in addition to the 10 percent minimum) for State-level activities, SEAs and Governors may each use up to 5 percent of their total allocations for program administration.		
<p><u>Minimum Program Requirements</u></p> <p>LEAs are required to use their Safe and Drug-Free Schools funds to carry out a comprehensive drug and violence prevention program, and must conduct a needs assessment of their students’ drug and violence problems, establish measurable goals and objectives for addressing those problems, and assess and publicly report progress toward attaining their goals and objectives. Governors are subject to similar requirements.</p>	<p><u>Principles of Effectiveness.</u> LEAs and Governors award recipients would be required to use their Safe and Drug-Free Schools funds to support drug- and violence-prevention services and activities that are: (1) based on a thorough assessment of objective data about the drug and violence problems in the schools and communities to be served; (2) designed to meet measurable goals and objectives aimed at ensuring that all schools served have a drug-free, safe, and orderly learning environment; (3) based on research or evaluation that provides evidence that the strategies used prevent or reduce drug use, violence, delinquency or disruptive student behavior; and (4) evaluated periodically to assess progress toward achieving their stated goals and objectives, and refined, improved, and strengthened (or the goals and objectives refined), as appropriate.</p> <p>School districts would also be required to develop a comprehensive “Safe Schools Plan” to ensure that essential program</p>	<p>Generally, would require LEAs, as well as Governors award recipients, to use their Safe and Drug-Free Schools funds to implement drug- and violence-prevention programs in a manner consistent with the <u>Principles of Effectiveness</u> in the Administration’s proposal. However, States could waive the requirement that prevention programs be research-based, and without the waiver, prevention programs would have to be based on a statutory definition of “scientifically-based research”. In addition, would greatly broaden the scope of the program by including specific authority for LEA funds to pay transportation costs for students in an unsafe public school (as determined by the State) to attend a safe public school, and for activities to improve academic achievement.</p> <p>Would require LEAs, in their application for funding, to explain their comprehensive plan for drug and violence</p>	<p>Generally, would require LEAs, but not Governors award recipients, to use their Safe and Drug-Free Schools funds to implement drug- and violence-prevention programs in a manner consistent with the <u>Principles of Effectiveness</u> in the Administration’s proposal. However, as drafted, the bill is somewhat inconsistent, in that the “use of funds” section authorizes expenditures for activities that do not meet the research-based standard of the principles.</p> <p>Would require school districts to develop a Safe Schools Plan, but mandates only about half of the components of the plan</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	components are in place and that school efforts are coordinated with related community-based activities.	prevention; but does not specify any programmatic components of the plan.	that are specified in the Administration's proposal.
<u>Additional Accountability Provisions</u> Permits SEAs to disapprove an LEA application in whole or in part, or to withhold, limit, or place restrictions on the use of funds awarded; and (2) requires States to report on program outcomes and make that report available to the public.	State and local recipients of Safe and Drug-Free Schools funds would be required to adopt outcome-based performance indicators and to report regularly on their progress. Continuation of local grants would be conditioned upon achievement of satisfactory progress toward meeting performance targets.	Would require SEAs, in determining whether to approve an LEA application for funding, to consider the quality of the LEA's comprehensive plan, including the extent to which the plan addresses the required Principles of Effectiveness.	Retains the two major accountability provisions in current law, while requiring SEAs to conduct a more substantive review of LEA funding applications.
<u>Gun Safety</u> No comparable provisions.	No comparable provisions.	Would permit LEAs that have expelled students under the Gun-Free Schools Act (GFSA) to use their SDFSCA State Grant funds to develop a plan, that may include promoting the benefits of child safety locks for firearms, to protect students and employees of public schools from gun violence; and would permit LEAs that have a high rate of expulsions under the GFSA to use their SDFSCA funds to study the effectiveness of promoting the benefits of child safety locks.	No comparable provisions.
<u>National Programs</u> Establishes a broad discretionary authority for drug and violence prevention activities	Retains a broad discretionary authority for activities that promote drug-free, safe, and	Compared to current law and the Administration's proposal, substantially	Retains the same broad Federal Activities discretionary authority as in current law, as

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
at the pre-kindergarten through postsecondary levels including (but not limited to) training, demonstrations, direct services to school districts, information dissemination, and program evaluation. Includes a separate authority for hate crimes prevention grants.	orderly learning environments at the pre-kindergarten through postsecondary levels. Eliminates the separate authority for hate crimes prevention grants (but retains hate crimes prevention activities under the discretionary authority). Adds a new authority for programs that promote lifelong physical fitness activity and healthy lifestyles.	shortens the list of explicitly authorized activities under this broad discretionary authority. Would no longer authorize prevention programs at the pre-kindergarten or postsecondary levels. Otherwise would continue to provide the Secretary flexibility to carry out a wide range of activities at the elementary and secondary school levels. Does not explicitly authorize, or prohibit, hate crimes prevention activities. Adds a new requirement for National Programs to fund a national clearinghouse to provide technical assistance on after school programs.	well as a separate authority for hate crimes prevention grants. Adds a new authority for the national coordinator program. Adds a requirement for a new Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee that would be authorized to carry out (not just advise on) a range of activities very similar to those the Secretary would be authorized to undertake.
<u>Project SERV</u> No express authorization; however, comparable activities are consistent with the current National Programs authority.	Would establish a new program to help school districts and communities respond to violent or traumatic crises.	Similar to current law.	Same as current law.
<u>Gun-Free Schools Act</u> The Gun-Free Schools Act (GFSA) states that each State receiving Federal funds under the ESEA must have a State law that requires all LEAs in the State to expel from school, for at least one year, any student found bringing a firearm to school. Such State laws must also authorize the LEA chief administering officer to modify any such expulsion on a case-by-case basis. Currently, the GFSA is authorized	Would incorporate the GFSA under the SDFSCA with modifications requiring that students found in possession of a firearm in school be assessed to determine whether they pose an imminent threat of harm to themselves or others. To ensure that these students remain connected to stable, supervised environments, students would have to receive appropriate counseling, supervision, and educational services	Same as current law; would move the GFSA provisions from ESEA Title XIV to Title IV.	Same as current law; would move the GFSA provisions from ESEA Title XIV to Title IV.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
under ESEA General Provisions, Title XIV, Part F.	while they are out of school, and appropriate mental health services before being permitted to return to school.		
<u>Discipline of Children with Disabilities</u> No comparable provisions.	No comparable provisions.	Would require school districts to permit school personnel to discipline a child with a disability who carries or possesses a weapon, possesses or uses illegal drugs or sells a controlled substance at school, or commits an aggravated assault or battery in the same manner as such personnel may discipline a nondisabled child; and would provide that children with disabilities who are suspended or expelled from school for any of these behaviors are not entitled to continuation of educational services.	No comparable provisions.
<u>New Part C Provisions</u> No comparable provisions.	No comparable provisions.	No comparable provisions to the new Senate provisions, but would add a <u>parental consent</u> requirement under which LEAs must inform parents of the content of SDFSCA programs or activities (other than classroom instruction) and, upon written notice from the parents of a student, withdraw their child from any such program or activity.	Would add a new Part C titled “School Safety and Violence Prevention” containing: (a) various provisions specifying that Title IV and <u>Title VI funds</u> may be used for a variety of drug prevention, violence prevention, and school safety activities, including the establishment of a <u>school uniform policy</u> ; (b) a requirement that States have a procedure in place to facilitate LEAs’ <u>transfer of school disciplinary records</u> for students who have been suspended or expelled from one school and seek to enroll in another school; (c) a mandate that

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
			all <u>materials</u> produced, procured, or distributed with ESEA funding include a <u>disclaimer</u> that any person who objects to the material is encouraged to direct his or her comments to the Secretary of Education, and a requirement that the Secretary designate an office to receive and summarize the comments; and (d) Congressional pronouncements on the <u>constitutionality of religious</u> components of <u>memorial services and memorials</u> at public schools that honor the memory of a person slain on campus.
<p><u>NCES Data Collection</u></p> <p>Requires NCES to collect data on the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of violence in elementary and secondary schools.</p>	Same as current law.	Would require NCES to collect data to determine: (1) the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of drug use by youth in schools and communities; and (2) the frequency, degree of harm, and morbidity of violent incidents, particularly firearm-related injuries and fatalities, by youth in schools and communities, including information with respect to (a) the relationship between victims and perpetrators, (b) demographic characteristics of victims and perpetrators, and (c) type of firearm used in the shooting.	Would require NCES to collect data to determine the incidence and prevalence of social disapproval of drug use in elementary and secondary schools.
<p><u>GAO Report</u></p> <p>No comparable provisions.</p>	No comparable provisions.	Would add a new provision requiring the General Accounting Office to transmit a	No comparable provisions.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		report to Congress on after-school programs.	
<u>Charitable Choice</u> No comparable provisions.	No comparable provisions.	Would add new provisions concerning the participation of charitable, religious, or private faith-based organizations in ESEA Title IV programs.	No comparable provisions.
<u>Pro-Children Act</u> . The Pro-Children Act of 1994 (Part C of Title X of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act) generally prohibits smoking indoors in schools or other facilities where children’s services are supported with Federal funds from the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Agriculture, and authorizes civil penalties for persons who violate such prohibition.	<u>Drug-, alcohol-, and tobacco-free learning environments</u> . Under Title IV, school districts receiving Safe and Drug-Free Schools funds would be required to prohibit the possession or use of tobacco, and the illegal possession or use of drugs or alcohol by any person in any form, at school, on school grounds, or at school-sponsored events. In addition, the Department of Education would be removed from the Pro-Children Act requirements (but the requirements would remain for the Departments of Health and Human Services and Agriculture).	Would leave the Pro-Children Act provisions in Title X of the Goals 2000 Act. (Section 602 of H.R. 4141 would repeal other titles of Goals 2000, but would not repeal Title X). Under ESEA Title IV, would require each SEA and LEA receiving Safe and Drug-Free Schools funds to have a policy that prohibits cigarette vending machines, and the illegal possession or use of drugs and alcohol, in any form, at any time, and by any person, in school buildings, on school grounds, or at any school-sponsored event.	Same as current law, but would move the Pro-Children Act provisions from Goals 2000 to Title IV of ESEA.

TITLE V – PROMOTING EQUITY, EXCELLENCE, AND PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE

Title V, Part A, Magnet Schools Assistance

<u>Application</u> Gives priority to applicants that: (1) demonstrate the greatest need for assistance; (2) propose new or significantly revised magnet school projects; and propose projects that (3) select students by lottery rather than	Deletes priorities for "demonstrating need" and "drawing on community involvement plans." Adds new priority for activities that will build local capacity to operate the magnet program once Federal assistance ends.	Keeps priority for “demonstrating need.” Deletes “implement innovative approaches” and “drawing on comprehensive community involvement” priorities. Does not add proposed “local capacity” priority.	Maintains all current law priorities. Adds Administration’s proposed “local capacity” priority.
--	---	--	---

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>through testing, (4) implement innovative approaches consistent with State plans, and (5) draw on comprehensive community involvement plans.</p> <p>Applications must be reviewed by the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights prior to approval.</p>	Same as current law.	Deletes the requirement.	Same as current law.
<p><u>Innovative Programs</u></p> <p>Authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of Magnet Schools funds for "Innovative Programs" that involve desegregation approaches other than magnet schools.</p>	Repeals Innovative Programs; incorporates an innovative programs authorization under the new choice "OPTIONS" program.	Repeals Innovative Programs. Bill incorporates separate "OPTIONS" program.	Same as current law.
<p><u>Uses of Funds</u></p> <p>Allowable uses of grant funds include: planning and promotional activities, purchase of books, materials, and equipment, and to pay or subsidize salaries of State-certified or licensed elementary and secondary school teachers and other instructional staff.</p>	Clarifies that funds may be used for instructional staff who "demonstrate knowledge, experience, or skills in a relevant field of expertise, such as the performing arts, medical sciences, or law." Adds a new allowable use of funds for activities, including professional development, that will build local capacity to operate magnet programs after Federal assistance ends.	Picks up Administration's proposal to allow use of funds for professional development activities, but not language on instructional staff.	Picks up Administration's proposal to allow use of funds for professional development activities, but not language on instructional staff. Adds language that gives LEAs the flexibility to serve students attending a school but not enrolled in a magnet program. Adds language to give LEAs the flexibility to design magnet schools for students at all grades.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Evaluation</u> Authorizes a reservation of up to 2 percent for evaluation and defines minimum evaluation requirements.	Increases allowable reservation of funds to 5 percent for expanded activities to include evaluation, technical assistance, information collection, and dissemination on successful magnet school projects. Adds a new requirement that evaluations address the extent to which magnet school programs continue after Federal assistance ends.	Permits a reservation of up to 2 percent for evaluation, technical assistance, and dissemination on successful magnet projects. Does not add new requirement that evaluations address the extent to which magnet school programs continue after Federal assistance ends.	Same as current law.

Title V, Charter Schools

Authorizes the planning, development, and initial implementation of charter schools that provide enhanced parental choice and are exempt from many statutory and regulatory requirements.	No changes proposed. Program is authorized through fiscal year 2003.	No changes proposed.	No changes proposed.
---	--	----------------------	----------------------

Title V, OPTIONS: Opportunities to Improve Our Nation’s Schools

No comparable program.	<u>Purpose</u> Authorizes new program to identify and support innovative approaches to high-quality public school choice.	Similar to Administration proposal. Allows projects for the development and design of new strategies for overcoming transportation barriers.	No comparable program.
	<u>Program Authorized</u> Competitive grants to State and local educational agencies of up to three years. Projects could include such choice options		

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	as: (1) inter-district approaches; (2) programs involving public school partnerships with institutions of higher education located on college campuses; (3)work site satellite schools at parents' place of employment; and (4) approaches to school desegregation through choice strategies other than magnet schools.		
Title V, Part D, Women's Educational Equity			
Authorizes: (1) local projects to develop model equity programs and implement gender equity policies and learning practices, and (2) research and development activities to advance gender equity.	Eliminates current requirement that two-thirds of program funds be used for local projects.	Maintains the two-thirds requirement.	Maintains the two-thirds requirement.

TITLE VI – CLASS SIZE REDUCTION

<u>Program Authorized</u> Title VI currently authorizes the “Innovative Education Program Strategies” program. (The FY 1999 and 2000 appropriations acts authorized the Class Size Reduction program under Title VI. Remaining Title VI entries in this column describe the program as authorized in the 1999 appropriation.)	Replaces Innovative Education Program Strategies with Class Size Reduction.	Consolidates Class-Size Reduction activity into Title II Teacher Empowerment authorization.	Same as House.
<u>Findings and Purpose</u> None.	Sets our 8 findings in support of the new Title VI and establishes the program's	Requires LEAs to spend some portion of their Title II grant on hiring fully qualified	Similar to House.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	purpose as helping States and LEAs to recruit, train, and hire 100,000 additional teachers to: (1) reduce class sizes nationally, in grades 1 through 3, to an average of 18 students per classroom; and (2) improve teaching in the early grades so that all students can learn to read independently and well by the end of the third grade.	teachers , including special education teachers, to reduce class size.	
<u>State Applications</u> No State application is required; however, the Department has required States to submit brief applications prior to receiving their allocations.	Requires applications that include: (1) the State's goals for reducing average class sizes in regular classrooms in grades 1 through 3; (2) descriptions of the SEA's plans for allocating program funds within the State and how the State will use other funds, including other Federal funds, to reduce class sizes and improve teacher quality and reading achievement within the State; and (3) an assurance that the SEA will submit such reports and information as the Secretary may reasonably require.		
<u>Local Applications</u> Requires LEAs to describe, as a part of their applications for Innovative Education Program Strategies funds, their plans to reduce class size by hiring highly qualified teachers.	Requires LEAs to submit an application that describes their plans to reduce class size by hiring highly qualified teachers.		

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p><u>Small LEAs</u></p> <p>Requires any LEA that receives an allocation that is less than the starting salary for a new teacher to form a consortium with at least one other LEA for the purpose of reducing class size, except that an LEA that has already reduced class size in the early grades to 18 or fewer children and intends to use its entire allocation for professional development is not required to form a consortium.</p>	<p>Allows an LEA that receives an allocation that is less than the starting salary for a new teacher to: (1) form a consortium with one or more LEAs for the purpose of reducing class size; (2) help pay the salary of a full- or part-time teacher hired to reduce class size; or (3) if the subgrant is less than \$10,000, use it for professional development related to teaching in small classes.</p>		
<p><u>Cost-Sharing Requirement</u></p> <p>No matching requirement.</p>	<p>No matching requirement for LEAs with child-poverty rates greater than 50 percent. For other LEAs, the maximum Federal share is 65 percent.</p>		
<p><u>Reporting Requirements</u></p> <p>Each school receiving program funds, or the LEA serving it, provides an annual report to parents, the general public, and the SEA on student achievement that results from hiring additional highly qualified teachers and reducing class size.</p> <p>States are required to report on program activities as a part of their biennial Title VI performance reports.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p> <p>States submit an annual report to ED on activities carried out with program funds.</p>		

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Authorization of Appropriations</u> Provides an appropriation only for fiscal year 1999.	Authorizes “such sums” for five fiscal years (2001-2005).		

TITLE VI – INNOVATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM STRATEGIES

<u>Program Authorized</u> Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994. The program supports general education reform and innovation.	Consolidated with the Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants and the Goals 2000 programs into the Teaching to High Standards State Grants program.	Same as current law.	Same as current law.
<u>Allocations</u> <u>Federal</u> 1 percent to outlying areas is reserved first; then formula to States based on population aged 5 to 17.	Not applicable.	Same as current law.	Same as current law.
<u>Within State</u> The SEA must distribute at least 85 percent of its funds to LEAs based on a formula, in accordance with criteria approved by the Secretary, that provides higher per-pupil allocations to LEAs that have the greatest number or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost.	Not applicable.	Same as current law, but adds requirements that (1) States must distribute all funds beyond the amount the State received in FY 2000 and (2) limit the State to using not more than 4 percent of its funds for administration of this program.	Same as current law.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>State-Level Activities</u> Technical assistance and direct grants to LEAs and statewide education reform activities, including effective schools programs, and support for planning, designing, and initial implementation of charter schools.	Not applicable.	Same as current law.	Same as current law, but adds two new allowable activities: (1) support for design and implementation of annual student assessments; and (2) support for implementation of State and local standards. Also, reduces the amount States may reserve for administration from 25 percent to 15 percent of the State reservation.
<u>LEA Uses of Funds</u> Activities that fall within one or more of nine specified areas of innovative assistance.	Not applicable	Revises allowable activities from current law to some extent and adds several allowable activities, including: single gender schools and classrooms; community service programs; youth entrepreneurship education programs; consumer, economic, and personal finance education; public school choice; and expanding and improving school-based mental health services.	Revises allowable activities from current law to some extent; includes efforts to reduce class size as an allowable activity.

TITLE VI – PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIPS

No comparable provisions.	No comparable provisions.	<u>Academic Achievement for All Act (Straight A’s Act)</u> <u>Authorization</u> Authorizes demonstration program under which up to 10 States may execute	<u>Performance Partnerships</u> Creates two new performance partnership programs as Title VI, <u>Education</u>
---------------------------	---------------------------	---	--

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		performance agreements with the Secretary permitting them to combine funds from most ESEA formula grant programs. LEAs in non-participating States also are permitted to execute such performance agreements, subject to State approval.	<u>Performance Partnerships</u> (Part G) and <u>Academic Achievement for All Demonstration</u> (Part H) program. Both programs would permit States that sign performance agreements with the Secretary to combine funds from most ESEA formula grant programs. The Part G program would be open to all States, while the Part H program would be limited to 15 States.
		<u>Performance Agreements</u> Requires that States prepare 5-year plans describing how they will combine and use funds to improve student achievement and set annual achievement goals for all groups of students, including goals to narrow the gap between high- and low-performing students. If Title I, Part A funds are included, plans must incorporate Title I accountability requirements, including adequate yearly progress and school improvement provisions.	Same as House bill. Part H requires States that do not include Title I only to set challenging academic performance goals, and not to narrow achievement gaps.
		<u>Distribution of Funds</u> Requires within-State distribution of funds to be determined by the Governor and State legislature, or the SEA in consultation with the Governor and State legislature. Requires a 100-percent LEA hold-harmless for any Title I, Part A funds included in performance agreements. Also requires equitable participation of private school students and staff.	Requires that combined funds be distributed according to State law, except that Title I, Part A funding would be allocated according to Title I requirements. Part H includes a 100-percent LEA hold-harmless for Title I, Part A funds, and also requires equitable participation of private school students and staff.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		<p><u>Uses of Funds</u></p> <p>Permits the use of funds combined under performance agreements for any elementary and secondary educational purposes permitted by State law. If Title I, Part A funds are included, States may use no more than 1 percent of their combined allocations for administrative costs; otherwise such costs are limited to 3 percent. Participating LEAs in non-participating States may use no more than 4 percent of their combined allocations for Administrative purposes.</p>	<p>Same as House bill, except that under the Part G proposal, if Title I Part funds are not included, administrative costs are limited to 5 percent at both the State and local levels.</p>
		<p><u>Accountability</u></p> <p>Requires participating States to report annually on student performance and how Federal funds have been used to improve student achievement and reduce achievement gaps. Requires the Secretary to terminate the performance agreement of any State that fails to “substantially” meet its performance goals at the end of the 5-year term of the agreement. Also permits the Secretary to reduce administrative funding for States that make “no progress” toward their performance goals after 5 years. States that meet their performance goals may renew their agreements for an additional 5 years.</p>	<p>Same as House bill.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		<p><u>Performance Rewards</u></p> <p>Requires the Secretary to set aside funding for such rewards within the Fund for the Improvement Education.</p> <p>Requires performance rewards equaling at least 5 percent of combined first-year allocations under their performance agreements for States that reduce by at least 25 percent the difference between the percentage of the highest- and lowest-performing groups reaching the proficient level, or that increase by 25 percent the proportion of two or more groups meeting State proficiency standards. States must reduce gaps or improve achievement in at least two content areas (one of which must be reading or math) and at least two grade levels.</p>	<p>Includes a one-time, \$2.5 billion mandatory appropriation for rewards under Part G.</p> <p>Requires (under part G) awards to all States that over a five-year period exceed the national average in reducing the achievement gap between poor and non-poor 4th and 8th grade students in math and English, as measured by NAEP or a similar non-State test. Awards would be made by formula based on State shares of poor children, and States would be eligible for such awards even if they do not participate in the performance partnership program.</p>
Title VII, Part A, Bilingual Education			
<p><u>State Formula Program</u></p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>If funds appropriated for Bilingual Education exceed \$220 million (FY 2000 appropriation was \$248 million), a State formula grant program would replace the current discretionary grant program. Funds would be distributed to States based on the State share of the limited English proficient student population except that all States would receive at least as much as they receive in fiscal year 2000 under the</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		<p>Subpart 1, Instructional Services and the SEA grant program in Subpart 2. Also, the formula sets aside 1.5 percent of the appropriation for Puerto Rico, .5 percent for the outlying areas, and .5 percent for entities serving Native Americans and Alaska Natives.</p> <p>States would use funds primarily for subgrants to local school districts for services to students.</p>	
<p><u>Bilingual Education Capacity and Demonstration Grants</u></p> <p>Authorizes 4 separate programs that primarily support competitive grants to school districts for instructional services.</p> <p>No comparable provision.</p> <p>Requires grantees to evaluate their projects every two years.</p>	<p>Collapses two of the grant activities, Program Development Grants and Implementation Grants and Enhancement Grants, into a single three-year grant activity.</p> <p>Authorizes competitive priorities for (1) school districts with little prior experience in serving limited English proficient students and that have rapidly growing populations of such students; and (2) grant applicants that demonstrate they have an effective program for helping LEP students learn English and achieve to high standards.</p> <p>Adds requirements that: (1) applications include baseline data on the performance</p>	<p>Retains authorization for current discretionary programs, but deletes some of the specific program requirements.</p> <p>No comparable provision.</p> <p>Dilutes current specific evaluation requirements but continues the current</p>	<p>Similar to Administration proposal.</p> <p>Authorizes competitive priority for school districts with little prior experience for all Institutional Services grants, not just Program Development and Enhancement grants as proposed by Administration.</p> <p>Similar to Administration proposal.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>The Secretary must terminate “comprehensive” and “systemwide” grants that cannot show that LEP students are making adequate progress in learning English and achieving to high academic standards.</p> <p>Requires school districts to notify parents of children who will participate in a program of the reasons for the selection of the child for participation and the nature of the program, and to provide parents an option to decline the enrollment of their child in the program.</p>	<p>of limited English proficient students who will participate in the project, and (2) grantees evaluate the projects annually to, among other things, assess the English language proficiency of participating students.</p> <p>Projects failing to demonstrate continuous and substantial progress in three years are required to submit a plan for project improvement for the Secretary's review. If grantees fail to make progress after implementing the plan, the Secretary is required to terminate the grant.</p> <p>Makes minor changes to current law.</p>	<p>requirement that instructional services grants be evaluated every two years.</p> <p>No termination requirement.</p> <p>Requires school districts to obtain informed parental consent prior to placement of a child in a program.</p>	<p>No termination requirement.</p> <p>Retains provisions of current law.</p>
<p><u>Research, Evaluation, and Dissemination</u></p> <p>Authorizes grants to SEAs, research and data collection, the National Clearinghouse and Academic Excellence grants. Academic Excellence grants are authorized to SEAs, LEAs, non-profits, and institutions of higher education for the dissemination of information on model instructional and professional development programs.</p>	<p>Limits Academic Excellence grants to SEAs, for the purpose of recognizing local educational agencies and other public and non-profit entities whose programs have demonstrated significant progress in assisting limited English proficient students in learning English within three years and meeting State content standards.</p>	<p>Deletes authorizations for Academic Excellence grants and for the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Authorizes research, through OERI, only to identify and disseminate successful models for teaching English and helping limited English proficient students meet State standards. No specific data collection authority.</p>	<p>Same as Administration bill.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p><u>Professional Development</u></p> <p>Authorizes four grant programs for assisting institutions of higher education and others to provide preservice and inservice training for teachers preparing to serve limited English proficient students. Projects are to be evaluated every two years. Authorizes postdoctoral fellowships.</p>	<p>Focuses each of the four existing programs on either preservice or inservice training. The Training for all Teachers Program would focus exclusively on the provision of inservice training to teachers and other educational personnel with a BA degree. The Bilingual Education Teachers and Personnel Grants would focus exclusively on preservice professional development. The Career Ladder program would focus exclusively on inservice training for educational personnel who do not have a BA degree. The proposal would eliminate the authorization for postdoctoral fellowships under the Bilingual Fellowship program. Projects would be evaluated annually.</p>	<p>Provides a general authorization for professional development grants to LEAs, IHEs, SEAs, and public and private organizations in consortia with LEAs. Retains authorization for postdoctoral fellowships. Projects must be evaluated every two years.</p>	<p>Same as current law except requires annual evaluations.</p>
Title VII, Part B Emergency Immigrant Education			
<p>Authorizes formula grants to States for subgrants to local educational agencies to improve the quality of instruction for recent immigrant students in districts where they are concentrated. When the appropriation exceeds \$50 million, States may use up to 20 percent of their award for discretionary grants to LEAs. States can retain 1.5 percent of their award for administrative costs.</p>	<p>Authorizes States to award all or any part of their allocation to LEAs on a discretionary basis (as appropriations bills for the last 4 years have allowed). Authorizes States to retain 2 percent of their award for administrative costs if they decide to make awards to LEAs on a discretionary basis.</p>	<p>Same as current law.</p>	<p>Same as current law except that States may retain 2 percent of their award for administrative costs if they distribute funds to LEAs on a discretionary basis.</p>

<p><u>Overview</u></p> <p>Provides financial assistance to school districts affected by federally connected children or Federal real property.</p>	<p>Amends current law to target funds to school districts based on the degree to which they are burdened by Federal activity.</p>	<p>Amends current law to provide funds based on historic levels of funding rather than current need.</p>	<p>Same as House.</p>
<p><u>Payments for Federal Property</u></p> <p><u>Section 8002 – Eligibility</u></p> <p>Provides funds to school districts where the Federal Government has acquired, since 1938, 10 percent or more of the assessed value of real property.</p> <p>Includes special provisions that grant eligibility to specific school districts and makes eligible property that does not meet the general standard for eligibility for payments.</p>	<p>Amends current law to target funds to school districts where the current estimated assessed value of Federal real property acquired since 1938 is at least 10 percent of the total assessed value of real property in the school district at the times of acquisition and at least 10 percent of the total current assessed value of real property in the school district.</p> <p>Eliminates the special provisions.</p>	<p>Creates a tiered eligibility system by providing payments first to eligible LEAs that received funds for any of the fiscal years 1989 through 1994, then to eligible LEAs that received funds for fiscal year 1995, and then to LEAs that are currently eligible but that did not receive funds for any of the previously specified fiscal years. Basic eligibility requirements remain the same as in the current law.</p> <p>Retains the special provisions.</p>	<p>Same as House.</p> <p>Same as House.</p>
<p><u>Section 8002 – Formula</u></p> <p>Provides funds based on a <u>maximum amount</u>, which is the product of : (1) the estimated assessed value of Federal property (based on the highest and best use of the property); and (2) the real property tax rate for current school expenditures.</p>	<p>Retains the calculation of the <u>maximum amount</u>.</p>	<p>Retains the <u>maximum amount</u>.</p>	<p>Same as House.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Limits the combination of Payments for Federal Property and Basic Support payments to the maximum Basic Support Payment.	Retains the limit on the combination of payments.	Modifies the limitation on the combination of payments for payments for Federal Property to be the higher of either (1) the maximum amount an LEA is eligible for under payments for Federal Property or (2) the maximum Basic Support Payment	Same as House.
Includes a <u>hold-harmless</u> provision that provides LEAs with at least 85 percent of FY 1996 payments for payments in subsequent years.	Includes a provision phasing out payments for LEAs that do not meet the new eligibility criteria. These payments would provide LEAs with a minimum of 75 percent of their FY 1999 payment in FY 2001, 50 percent of the FY 1999 payment in FY 2002, and 25 percent of their FY 1999 payment in 2003.	Alters the <u>hold-harmless</u> provision by (1) providing "pre-1995 recipients" (LEAs that were eligible for a section 8002 payment for any fiscal year 1989 - 1994) with a "foundation payment" of 37 percent of the amount they were eligible for in 1994 (or the latest year for which they were eligible); (2) providing all LEAs that received a payment for FY 1995 with payments based on the proportion of each LEA's assessed value in 1995 compared with the total assessed value for all eligible LEAs in 1995; (3) providing "special payments" to certain designated LEAs; (4) distributing 25 percent of the remaining funds to "pre-1995 recipients" in proportion to their "foundation payments"; and (5) distributing 75 percent of the remaining funds to all eligible recipients based on the proportion that their current fiscal year assessed value is of the total current assessment values for all eligible LEAs.	Same as House.
Includes a <u>priority payments</u> provision that enables some LEAs to receive a larger percentage of their maximum amount than	Deletes priority and special payments.	Retains priority and special payments with some amendments.	Same as House.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>they would otherwise receive and <u>special payments</u> that enable some LEAS to receive a supplemental grant for Federal property if they meet the criteria in the special provisions.</p> <p>Does not include a <u>preliminary payment</u> provision.</p> <p>Provides no limit on the number of years between when property becomes eligible for payment and when an application for funds must be filed to retain eligibility.</p> <p>No limit on when LEAs must submit payment data.</p> <p>No requirement for the timing of final payments by the Department.</p>	<p>Does not include a <u>preliminary payment</u> provision.</p> <p>Same as current law.</p> <p>Same as current law.</p> <p>Same as current law.</p>	<p>Includes a preliminary payment provision under which LEAs receive 60 percent of their payment from the previous year within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.</p> <p>Same as current law.</p> <p>Requires applicants to submit payment data within 30 days of the application deadline.</p> <p>Requires Department to make final payments within 12 months from application deadline, and denies payments to LEAs that do not submit timely applications.</p>	<p>Same as House, except requires LEAs to have submitted current year payment data to qualify for a preliminary payment.</p> <p>Requires LEAs to apply for Payments for Federal Property funds on behalf of eligible Federal property within 5 years in order to retain or establish eligibility for that property.</p> <p>Requires applicants to submit payment data “expeditiously.”</p> <p>Requires Department to make final payments within 12 months from application deadline.</p>
<p><u>Basic Support Payments</u></p> <p><u>Section 8003(b) – Eligibility</u></p> <p>Compensates school districts for “a” and “b” children. The “a” children are: (1) children living on Indian lands; (2) children of members of the uniformed</p>	<p>Compensates school districts for “a” children only.</p>	<p>Same as current law.</p>	<p>Raises the weight for military "b" children (children whose parents are in the uniformed services and do not reside on Federal property) from .10 to .25. Raises</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>services living on Federal property; (3) children of Federal employees who both live and work on Federal property, and children of foreign military officers living on Federal property. The “b” children are other types of federally connected children who reside with their parents who either live or work on Federal property, but not both.</p> <p>At least 400 or 3 percent of students in average daily attendance (ADA) must be federally connected for a school district to be eligible for payment.</p>	<p>Any school district with “a” students is eligible for payment.</p>	<p>Any school district with “a” students is eligible for payment.</p>	<p>the weight for civilian "b" children (children whose parents either live or work on Federal property) from .05 to .10.</p> <p>Same as current law.</p>
<p><u>Section 8003(b) – Formula</u></p> <p>Calculates <u>maximum payments</u> based on the product of the number of weighted eligible students and the highest of four <u>local contribution rate</u> options. The rates are: (1) one-half of the average State per-pupil expenditure (SPPE); (2) one-half of the average US per-pupil expenditure; (3) the local contribution rate of comparable LEAs; and (4) the SPPE multiplied by the local contribution percentage for the State.</p> <p>Includes a mechanism, referred to as the <u>Learning Opportunity Threshold</u> (LOT), for reducing payments when funds are insufficient to fund maximum payments fully. This mechanism favors school districts that either: (1) have large</p>	<p>Calculates maximum payments based on the product of the number of weighted eligible students and the highest of three local cost rate options. The options are: (1) the local contribution percentage multiplied by the US average per-pupil expenditure; (2) the local contribution rate of comparable LEAs; and (3) the SPPE multiplied by the local contribution percentage for the State.</p> <p>Revises the LOT to be the sum of: (1) 50 percent; and students. (2) one-half of the percentage of federally connected students.</p>	<p>Retains current law LCR options and integrates Payments for Heavily Impacted Districts into the Basic Support Payment authority but with a separate payment formula. (See section 8003(f) for eligibility criteria and the payment formula).</p> <p>Same as current law, but establishes a minimum LOT of 40 percent for LEAs with both (1) fewer than 1,000 students and (2) per-pupil expenditures below the State average.</p>	<p>Same as House.</p> <p>Same as current law.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>proportions of federally connected students; or (2) rely on Impact Aid for a large proportion of their funds. The LOT percentage is multiplied by the maximum payment to determine the LOT payment. The LOT percentage is the sum of the percentage of unweighted federally connected students in average daily attendance and the maximum payment as a percentage of current expenditures.</p> <p>Creates several exceptions for a small number of school districts for weights assigned to students and use of the LOT.</p> <p>Includes a hold-harmless provision (under Section 8003(e)) that provides for payments of not less than 85 percent of the preceding year's payment for a maximum of two consecutive years.</p> <p>Enables LEAs to weight military "b" students as if they were military "a"</p>	<p>Clarifies that funds are ratably increased or decreased from the LOT payment (but may not exceed the maximum payment) when the appropriation is insufficient to fund maximum payments fully.</p> <p>Eliminates these exceptions.</p> <p>Eliminates the hold-harmless payment.</p> <p>Eliminates the provision.</p>	<p>Expands these exceptions by providing additional exceptions for weights that enable LEAs to continue to count and weigh children as living on Federal property even if the land they reside on is converted from Federal ownership to private, taxable property. Local tax revenue received from the privatized property would be offset against the LEA's payment.</p> <p>Same as current law.</p> <p>Similar to current law, but clarifies that it applies to military housing that is being</p>	<p>Provides a hold-harmless payment at the per-weighted student of pay unit funding level in fiscal year 2000. Funds are ratably reduced from this level if necessary.</p> <p>If data from the third preceding year are not available for State or U.S. per-pupil expenditures, the Secretary must use data from the most recent year he considers satisfactory.</p> <p>Same as House.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
students if they are living off base because their military housing is undergoing renovation.		renovated or rebuilt. Also provides that LEAs may claim students at the higher weight for a maximum of three years. Expands current law with provisions similar to FY 1999 and 2000 appropriations language for some districts uniquely affected by military “Build to Lease” programs.	Same as House.
<u>Payments for Children with Disabilities Section 8003(d) – Eligibility</u> Three types of students generate funds: Indian "a's;" military "a's;" and military "b's."	Two types of students generate funds: Indian "a's" and military "a's."	Same as current law.	Same as current law.
<u>Section 8003(d) -- Use of funds</u> Funds must be used to provide a free appropriate public education to eligible children in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).	Funds may be used to provide either a free appropriate public education or early intervention services in accordance with the IDEA.	Same as current law.	Same as Administration.
<u>Payments for Heavily Impacted LEAs (Section 8003(f))</u> Provides multiple sets of complex eligibility criteria and formulas. Allows LEAs to qualify for these need-based funds even when their tax effort is up to 5 percent less than that of comparable school districts. Enables LEAs to become eligible	Provides for a single set of <u>eligibility criteria</u> . LEAs must have an enrollment of at least 40 percent federally connected "a" students and a tax rate of at least 100 percent of comparable LEAs to be eligible. Eliminates the presence of <u>unusual</u>	Provides fiscal year 2001 heavily impacted basic support payments for all LEAs that received 8003(f) funds in FY 2000. Beginning in FY 2002, two sets of <u>eligibility</u> rules would apply. LEAs paid for FY 2001 would have to be (1) a coterminous LEA;	Similar to the House, but LEAs that receive heavily impacted payments for FY 2000 must meet one of the following <u>eligibility</u> requirements beginning in 2001: Be 1) a coterminous LEA; (2) an LEA with average daily attendance of at least

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>for payments based on the presence of <u>unusual geographic factors</u>.</p>	<p><u>geographic factors</u> as a criterion for eligibility.</p> <p>A single <u>formula</u> would be used to determine the maximum payments. It would reflect the unmet cost of educating a student. Unmet cost would be computed by reducing the cost of educating federally connected students by the amount of the LEA's resources available for current expenditures, including its Basic Support Payment and Payment for Children with Disabilities.</p>	<p>(2) an LEA with average daily attendance of at least 35% federally connected children, with a per-pupil expenditure (PPE) less than either the State or national average and a tax rate of at least 95% of the state average (LEAs smaller than 350 children are deemed to meet the PPE requirement); or (3) an LEA with at least 25,000 in ADA, 50% federally-connected, and at least 6,000 military and civilian "a" children. Those LEAs that were not eligible for FY 2001 would have to apply in FY 2001 for funds in 2002 and meet the following, more stringent requirements: Be (1) a coterminous LEA; or (2) an LEA with average daily attendance of at least 50% federally connected children (or, for those LEAs ineligible to claim "civilian b" children, 40%) and a PPE less than the state average and a tax rate of at least 95% of the State average (but LEAs with less than 350 children may be compared to one comparable school district rather than the state average).</p> <p>Retains current law regarding <u>unusual geographic factors</u>.</p> <p>Funds are distributed based on a <u>formula</u> similar to the Basic Support Payments formula. However, the student weights, LCR options, and LOT would generally be higher and result in substantially higher payments. Funds are distributed generally based on the following formula: the</p>	<p>35% federally connected children, with a PPE less than either the State or national average and a tax rate of at least 95% of the State average; (3) an LEA with average daily attendance of at least 30 % federally connected children and tax rate of at least 6,000 military and civilian "a" children.</p> <p>Like the House , LEAs that were not eligible for FY 2001 would have to apply in FY 2001 for assistance in 2002 and meet similar, more stringent eligibility requirements. Unlike the House, the Senate would delay the effects of ineligibility by allowing an LEA to receive a heavily impacted payment in a year that it did not continue to meet the eligibility requirements.</p> <p>Same as Administration regarding <u>unusual geographic factors</u>.</p> <p>The formula is similar to the House.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		<p><u>maximum amount</u> is determined by multiplying the total weighted student units by 80% of the higher of either the State or national average per-pupil expenditure for the 3rd preceding fiscal year. The exceptions increasing student weights include weights of: 0.55 for military and low-rent housing "b" students for LEAs that have at least 35 % of those students; 1.75 for LEAs with less than 100 children, and 1.25 for LEAs with 100 to 750 children. In addition, an LEA with an enrollment that exceeds 25,000, with 50% federally connected children and at least 6,000 military and civilian "a" children receives an additional weight of 1.35 for each "a" child. All eligible LEAs would be deemed to have a LOT percentage of 100.</p>	
<p><u>Additional Payments for LEAs with High Concentrations of Children with Severe Disabilities (Section 8003(g))</u></p> <p>Funds would be paid on behalf of children with severe disabilities.</p>	<p>Repeals this payment authority, which has never been funded.</p>	<p>Same as Administration.</p>	<p>Same as Administration.</p>
<p><u>Policies and Procedures Relating to Children Residing on Indian Lands (Section 8004)</u></p> <p>Includes language designed to ensure that: (1) Indian children participate in education programs on an equal basis; and (2) Indian parents and tribes have an opportunity to</p>	<p>Adds language requiring LEAs that serve children living on Indian lands to put in place a set of policies and procedures to encourage fuller participation by Indian</p>	<p>Same as current law.</p>	<p>Same as current law.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
provide input on the LEA's education programs.	tribes and parents. In addition, the language clarifies that Impact Aid funds may be spent for specific purposes to benefit Indian children.		
<u>Application for Payments under Sections 8002 and 8003 (Section 8005)</u> The Secretary is prohibited from approving applications more than 60 days late. The Secretary is required to reduce funds by 10 percent for an LEA that submits an application not more than 60 days late. Includes a special provision that raises the LOT payment for a State that applies for funds on behalf of LEAs within the State.	Retains the provision regarding the due date. Deletes the special provision.	Requires the Secretary to provide written notice to LEAs that have both (1) failed to file applications within a deadline and (2) filed an application for the previous year that they need to file an application within 60 days. The Secretary cannot approve applications that are filed more than 60 days after the written notice is sent. LEAs that file within 60 days after the notice are subject to the 10 percent payment reduction in current law. Same as current law.	Same as current law. Same as current law.
<u>Payments for Sudden and Substantial Increases in Attendance of Military Dependents (Section 8006)</u> Provides payments for large rapid increases of military dependents within an LEA.	Repeals this authority, which has never been funded as authorized in 1994.	Same as Administration.	Same as Administration.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p><u>Construction (Section 8007)</u></p> <p>Provides payments for construction for LEAs that receive a Basic Support Payment and: (1) have at least 50 percent Indian "a" students; (2) have at least 50 percent military "a" and "b" students; (3) receive a Payment for Heavily Impacted LEAs; or (4) receive a payment for Sudden and Substantial Increases in Attendance of Military Dependents. Funds are distributed based on the weighted student count in the Basic Support Payments formula.</p>	<p>Focuses all funds on predominantly Indian districts. Provides payments for construction and minimal initial equipment purchased in connection with a new building or the renovation of an existing building. An LEA is eligible if it receives a Basic Support payment and has at least 50 percent Indian "a" students. Funds are distributed on a pro rata basis. LEAs are required to provide a 50 percent match and provide a written plan, based on an assessment of construction needs, for how the LEA would use the funds.</p>	<p><u>Formula grants</u> – Reserves 35 percent of appropriated funds for LEAs with at least 50 percent of their students residing on Indian lands and 35 percent for LEAs with at least 50 percent federally connected military students.</p> <p><u>Competitive grants</u> – Reserves 30 percent of appropriated funds for competitive construction grants to LEAs that meet the following eligibility requirements: The LEA does not have the authority or capacity to issue bonds for capital expenditures, and (1) the LEA received assistance under section 8002 and has an assessed value per pupil less than the state average; or (2) the LEA receives assistance under the section 8007 formula grants and has a school facility emergency that poses a health and safety hazard.</p> <p>Award criteria are (1) lack of fiscal capacity; (2) extent of nontaxable Federal property; (3) number or percentage of federally connected children in the LEA; (4) extent of health and safety problems and overcrowded conditions; and (5) age of facilities. The maximum award is \$3 million within a five-year period; a 50% match would be required, including in-kind contributions.</p>	<p><u>Formula grants</u> -- Reserves 20 percent of the funds for LEAs with 50 percent or more Indian "a" students, with 50 percent or more military "a" or "b" students, or that received a Payment for a Heavily Impacted District during the preceding year.</p> <p>Similar to the House provisions. Reserves 80% of funds for <u>competitive grants</u>. 45% of these funds are reserved for LEAs with at least 25 percent Indian "a" children and LEAs that receive payments under section 8002 and have an assessed value per pupil less than the state average. 45% of funds are for LEAs with at least 25% military or civilian "a" students or military "b" students. 10% of funds are available for LEAs with at least 50% Indian "a" students and a school emergency that poses a health and safety hazard. Award criteria and matching requirements are the same as the House.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p><u>Facilities Maintenance (Section 8008)</u></p> <p>Enables the Secretary to provide for the upkeep of school facilities that generally serve military "a" and "b" students and are owned by the Federal Government. The Secretary is required to transfer these school facilities to LEAs or other appropriate entities as soon as practicable.</p>	<p>Retains this authority with no substantive changes.</p>	<p>Same as current law.</p>	<p>Same as current law.</p>
<p><u>State Consideration of Payments in Providing State Aid (Equalization Provisions, Section 8009)</u></p> <p>Prohibits States from reducing State aid based on Impact Aid payments unless the State has equalized current expenditures for education.</p>	<p>Adds a provision that a State's per-pupil expenditure must be at least 80 percent of the U.S. average before it is eligible to reduce State aid based on Impact Aid payments.</p>	<p>Same as current law.</p>	<p>Retains this authority with no substantive changes.</p>
<p><u>Administrative Hearings and Judicial Review (Section 8011)</u></p> <p>Establishes administrative hearing and judicial review rights for applicants, including a 60-day deadline for requesting judicial review.</p>	<p>Same as current law, with minor technical amendment.</p>	<p>Allows LEAs 60 days from adverse action to request administrative hearing (rather than the current 30-day regulatory requirement); and requires judicial review requests to be within 30 working days.</p>	<p>Allows LEAs 60 days from adverse action to request administrative hearing (rather than the current 30-day regulatory requirement).</p>

TITLE IX – INDIAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION

Title IX, Part A, Indian Education

<p><u>Formula Grants to Local Educational Agencies</u></p> <p>If an eligible LEA fails to establish a parent advisory committee, permits an</p>	<p>Clarifies that Indian tribes that apply in place of an LEA are not subject to</p>	<p>Same as the Administration proposal.</p>	<p>Same as Administration proposal.</p>
---	--	---	---

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Indian tribe that represents at least half of the LEA's Indian students to apply instead.	statutory requirements relating to parent committees, maintenance of effort, or submission of grant applications for SEA review.		
Authorizes formula grants to schools operated or supported by BIA.	Clarifies that BIA schools must submit an application to the Secretary but are not subject to statutory requirements related to parent committees, maintenance of effort, or SEA review of applications. Also, allows BIA to use either Department of Education or BIA eligibility forms to document student eligibility.	Same as the Administration proposal.	Same as Administration proposal.
Authorizes grantees to conduct a range of activities related to improving the quality of education for Indian students.	Adds activities: incorporating Indian-specific content and culturally responsive teaching strategies into curriculum; promoting coordination between tribal, Federal, and State public schools; and gifted and talented education.	Does not add any of the Administration's proposed activities. Adds new activity for "family literacy services."	Adds all the Administration's proposed activities except "gifted and talented" and adds new activity for "family literacy services."
<u>Integration of Services Authorized</u> No comparable program.	No comparable program.	Creates a new program integration authority that would permit integration of federally funded education and related services programs, or portions thereof, serving Indian students into a "single, coordinated, comprehensive program."	Same as House language.
<u>Demonstration Grants</u> Authorizes demonstration grants to SEAs, LEAs, tribes and tribal institutions for innovative programs for educationally deprived children and for other purposes.	Adds requirement that applicants demonstrate that their proposed program is research based.	Same as Administration proposal.	Same as Administration proposal.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Professional Development Grants</u> Requires individuals who receive training to work in a field related to their training and benefiting the Indian community or pay back the amount of their award.	Exempts participants who receive inservice training from the requirement. Adds authority for professional development grants to consortia of tribal colleges and institutions of higher education that award a degree in education.	Same as current law. No comparable provision.	Same as current law. Adds authority for professional development grants to consortia of tribal colleges, institutions of higher education that award a degree in education, and 1 or more elementary or secondary schools operated by BIA, LEAs serving Indian children, or tribal educational agencies.
<u>Additional Discretionary Programs</u> Authorizes activities in the areas of: (1) strengthening tribal departments of education; (2) gifted and talented education; (3) postsecondary fellowships; and (4) adult education.	Repeals these unfunded programs, which duplicate other activities.	Same as Administration’s proposal.	Same as current law.

Title IX, Part B, Native Hawaiian Education

Authorizes seven separate programs for the education of Native Hawaiians and to encourage their participation in program planning and management: (1) Native Hawaiian Education Council and Island Councils; (2) Family-Based Education Centers; (3) Higher Education Program; (4) Gifted and Talented Program; (5) Special Education Program; (6) Curriculum Development, Teacher	Consolidates the seven programs into one program authority, while allowing continuation of the full array of activities under current programs.	Repeals Native Hawaiian Education programs.	Consolidates <u>six</u> programs into one program authority, while allowing continuation of the full array of activities under current programs. Keeps the Native Hawaiian Education Council and Island Councils as a separate authority.
--	---	---	---

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Training and Recruitment Program; and (7) Community-Based Education Learning Centers.			

Title IX, Part C, Alaska Native Education

Authorizes three separate programs for the education of Alaska Natives: (1) Educational Planning, Curriculum Development, Teacher Training and Recruitment; (2) Home Based Education for Preschool Children; and (3) Student Enrichment.	Consolidates the three programs into one program authority, while allowing continuation of all activities under current programs.	Same as Administration proposal.	Same as Administration proposal
--	---	----------------------------------	---------------------------------

TITLE X – PROGRAMS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Title X, Part A, Fund for the Improvement of Education

<u>Purpose</u> Authorizes the Secretary to support nationally significant programs and projects to improve the quality of education, help students achieve to high standards, and help achieve the National Education Goals.	Clarifies that this authority is for projects to improve the quality of <u>elementary and secondary</u> education.	Clarifies that this activity is to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education. Specifically prohibits federally sponsored testing or federal endorsement of elementary and secondary school curriculum.	Clarifies that this activity is to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education.
<u>Authorized Activities</u> Authorizes over 20 specific activities.	Simplifies and reduces the list of authorized activities, although the general authority would continue to authorize the activities that have been deleted.	Authorizes 17 activities and programs.	Authorizes seven authorized uses of funds: (1) Partnerships in Character Education; (2) Scholar-Athlete Competitions; (3) Elementary School Counseling Demonstration; (4) Smaller Learning Communities; (5) National Student and Parent Mock Elections; (6) recognition

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
			programs, and (7) development and evaluation of model strategies for professional development.
<u>Program Evaluation</u> Requires the Secretary to ensure that activities are designed so that their effectiveness can be ascertained.	Requires applicants to establish goals and objectives and describe how proposed activities would help meet those goals and objectives. Requires all grantees to evaluate, at the midpoint and end of projects achieving goals and objectives.	Adds requirement that research be scientifically-based. Requires grant recipients to conduct evaluations of program effectiveness and submit reports to the Secretary.	Same as current law.
<u>Award Requirements</u> Explicitly authorizes funding of unsolicited proposals as well as awards based on competitions. No comparable provisions.	Authorizes the Secretary to limit competitions to particular types of entities. Authorizes the Secretary to require grantees to provide matching funds from non-Federal sources and to limit competitions to particular types of entities, such as LEAs and SEAs.	Authorizes awards on the basis of competitions announced by the Secretary. Drops provision in current law explicitly allowing support for unsolicited proposals. Authorizes the Secretary to require matching funds. Adds general FIE application requirements.	Same as House. Drops provision in current law allowing support for unsolicited proposals.
<u>Elementary School Counseling Demonstrations</u> Authorizes grants of up to \$400,000 to LEAs to initiate or expand elementary school counseling programs.	Repealed.	Expands the program to include secondary schools. Eliminates current annual grant maximum of \$400,000. Deletes program-specific application requirements. Reduces the specificity in the list of collaborative partners but does not substantively change the allowable	Similar to current law.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		partners. Adds provisions requiring a team approach to counseling and ensuring that counseling staff hired with grant funds spend most of their time on counseling services. Reduces allowable administrative costs to 3 percent (from 5 percent in current law). Deletes specific definitions of school counselor, school psychologist, and school social worker and allows State law to govern the definition of each.	
<u>Character Education</u> Authorizes up to 10 grants per year to SEAs, in partnership with LEAs, to implement programs that incorporate character education. Limits funding to \$1 million per State.	Authorizes grants to SEAs, LEAs, and consortia of such agencies. Drops limits on the number of grants made per year and funding.	Similar to Administration proposal in terms of allowable grantees and caps.	Removes restriction on the number of grants per year. Expands eligibility to allow LEAs and consortia that include at least one LEA or SEA. Removes caps on number of grants and level of funding.
Requires applicants to form and describe partnerships, describe project goals and activities, conduct a project evaluation, and establish a State clearinghouse on character education.	Drops requirement for formal partnership. Requires a description of the linkages among the character education program and existing reform efforts at the State and local level. Drops requirement for each grantee to establish a clearinghouse.	Drops requirement for partnerships and State clearinghouses.	Similar to Administration proposal.
Lists the elements of character: caring; civic virtue and citizenship; justice and fairness; respect; responsibility; and trustworthiness.	Eliminates this list. Applicants would have the flexibility to decide what elements of character are important to their community	Revises the list of elements of caring. Includes honesty, citizenship, courage, justice, respect, personal responsibility, and trustworthiness.	Same as current law.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
No comparable provision.	Authorizes the Secretary to support research, development, dissemination, technical assistance, and evaluation activities to improve character education projects being supported. Funds could be used to investigate and evaluate the effectiveness of specific instructional models and practices, to provide technical assistance directly to grantees, to conduct a national evaluation of the character education program, and to establish a national clearinghouse of information on character education.	No provision for national activities.	Authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of the funds for national research dissemination, and evaluation activities
<u>Promoting Scholar-Athlete Competitions</u> Authorizes grants to reimburse an organization for the costs of conducting scholar-athlete games.	Repealed.	Repealed.	Substantively unchanged.
<u>Smaller Learning Communities</u> Authorizes grants to LEAs to create smaller learning communities.	Repealed, but activities to create smaller learning communities are explicitly authorized under FIE.	Authorizes the Secretary to use funds to promote the creation of smaller learning communities within high schools.	Same as current except that it specifically makes eligible: (1) LEAs; (2) elementary or secondary schools; (3) BIA-funded schools; or (4) a partnership including one of those entities.
<u>National Student and Parent Mock Election</u> Authorizes grants to national nonprofit nonpartisan organizations to promote voter participation by carrying out voter education activities with students and their parents.	Repealed.	Repealed.	Retained, and allows participation by territories and DoD schools as well as 50 states.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Model Projects</u> Authorizes grants to cultural institutions to develop and expand model projects of outreach activities for at-risk children.	Repealed.	Repealed.	Repealed.

Title X, Part B, Gifted and Talented Children

Authorizes grants or contracts to public and private agencies to support activities that meet the educational needs of gifted and talented students. Requires a National Center for Research and Development in the Education of Gifted and Talented Children and Youth. Mandates an evaluation of the program.	Makes minor revisions. Requires the National Center to focus on dissemination of the results of Center activities to schools with high percentages of economically, disadvantaged students. Authorizes, rather than mandates, program evaluation.	Retains an authority for competitive grants, but requires a portion of any increase over the FY 2000 level to be used to increase the size of awards to SEAs. Establishes a formula grant program once the appropriation reaches \$50 million, with funds awarded to SEAs on the basis of the number of children aged 5 to 17. SEAs	Similar to House, but omits the language requiring a portion of any increase over FY 2000 to be used for larger SEA awards, and requires that SEAs award 88 percent of funds competitively to LEAs. Adds model development to the list of activities to be carried out by the National Center.
Requires that half the grants be used to serve students not otherwise served through traditional methods.		would award 95 percent of the funds competitively to LEAs. Continues authority for the National Center. Eliminates the requirement.	Eliminates the requirement.

Title X, Part C, International Education Program

<u>Administrative Amendments</u> Resides in Title VI of the Goals 2000: Education America Act (P.L. 103-227)	Transfers the International Education Program to Part C of Title X of the ESEA.	Repealed.	Transfers program to Part F of Title V of ESEA, and combines the program with Civic Education.
---	---	-----------	--

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p><u>Program Focus – Assessment and Information</u></p> <p>Requires the Secretary to support research that assesses the education systems of other foreign countries, particularly Great Britain, France, Germany, and Japan.</p>	No changes.		No requirement.
<p><u>Program Focus – International Education Exchange</u></p> <p>Requires the Secretary to support education exchange activities in civics, government, and economic education between the United States and eligible countries in Central and Eastern Europe, the Commonwealth of Independent States, and any former Soviet republic. Awards are intended to make American curricular innovations in civics and economics available to educators in eligible countries, as well as to create programs that provide American students with exposure to the history and experiences of eligible countries.</p> <p>Specifies that funds be evenly split between civic and economic education.the Commonwealth of Independent States, and any former Soviet republic. Awards are intended to make American curricular innovations in civics and economics available to educators in eligible countries, as well as to create programs that provide American students with exposure to the history and experiences of eligible countries.</p>	Extends eligibility to the Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland, and “any other emerging democracy in a developing country.”		Same change as the Administration bill.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Specifies that funds be evenly split between civic and economic education.			Deletes requirement that funds be split between civic and economic education.

Title X, Part D, Arts in Education

Provides grants to the John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts for its education program and to VSA Arts for its programs to encourage greater involvement of persons with disabilities in the arts. All program funds go to these two organizations in years in which the appropriation is \$9 million or less. Also authorizes national demonstration and Federal leadership activities to encourage the integration of the arts into the school curriculum.	Eliminates required set-aside for the Kennedy Center and VSA Arts. Adds an authorized activity to “support model arts and cultural programs for at-risk youth, particularly programs that use arts and culture to promote students’ academic progress.” Repeals Subpart 2	Modifies the list of eligible recipients so that SEAs are no longer specifically eligible, but States are. Eliminates the required set-aside for the Kennedy Center and VSA Arts. Modifies the authorized activities. Repeals Subpart 2.	Revises the special rule so that all program funds go to the Kennedy Center and VSA arts in any year in which the appropriation is \$10 million or less. Changes the purpose of Subpart 2 so that the focus is on at-risk youth rather than at-risk children and youth. Revises Subpart 2 so that a portion of the funds may be used by the Secretary for evaluation.
---	---	--	---

Title X, Part E, Inexpensive Book Distribution Program

Awards funds to Reading is Fundamental to provide, through aid to local nonprofit groups and volunteer organizations, reading motivation activities.	No change.	Same as current law.	Same as current law.
--	------------	----------------------	----------------------

Ellender Fellowships

Provides fellowships to students of limited economic means, recent immigrants, students of migrant parents, teachers of these students, and older Americans, so that they may participate in programs supported by the Close Up Foundation.	Repeals the program.	Same as current law.	Same as current law.
---	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Title X, Part F, Civic Education

<p><u>Program Focus – Instruction on History & Democracy</u></p> <p>To educate students in public and private schools about the history and principles of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and to foster civic competence and responsibility. Activities include courses on the Constitution, simulated congressional hearings, and a national competition of simulated hearings among secondary school students.</p>	<p>No changes.</p>	<p>Same as current law, except adds requirement for activities to prevent school violence and the abuse of drugs and alcohol.</p>	<p>Merges Civic Education with International Education. Otherwise same as House.</p>
<p><u>Program Focus – Instruction in Civics, Government & the Law</u></p> <p>Authorizes awards to SEAs, LEAs, and other public and private non-profit agencies, organizations, and institutions to assist students in achieving State content standards in civics, government, and the law. Funding could be used for curricular development, professional development, increased community involvement in civics education, or technical assistance.</p>	<p>Repealed.</p>	<p>Same as Administration.</p>	<p>Same as Administration.</p>

Title X, Part G, 21st Century Community Learning Centers

<p><u>Purpose</u></p> <p>Authorizes the Secretary to award grants to rural and inner-city public schools or consortia of schools to plan, implement, or</p>	<p>Clarifies that the eligible recipients of grants are community-based organizations or LEAs, applying on behalf of schools.</p>	<p>Consolidates program into Title IV, Safe and Drug-Free Schools. See Title IV writeup.</p>	<p>Reauthorizes the program under Title III of the ESEA (new Part A).</p>
---	---	--	---

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
expand projects that benefit the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of a rural or inner-city community.	Requires that funds be targeted to communities with a substantial need for expanded learning opportunities, as evidenced by a high percentage of low-achieving students and lack of resources. Expands list of acceptable locations to include small cities, in addition to inner cities and rural areas.		
<u>Application Requirements</u> Requires the application to include: a comprehensive plan; an evaluation of needs, resources, goals, and objectives for the proposed project; and a description of project activities and collaborative efforts.	Requires grantees to provide at least half of the cost of the project from other sources – in cash or in kind. Requires grantees to expend, from non-Federal sources, at least as much each year as in the preceding year. Requires information on how the applicant will continue the project after the grant ends.		Same as current law.
<u>Priority</u> Requires the Secretary to give priority to projects that offer a broad selection of services that address the needs of the community.	Adds a new priority for projects that offer significant, expanded learning opportunities for children and youth in the community.		Same as current law.
<u>Community – Based Organizations</u> No comparable provision.	Authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 10 percent of the funds appropriated in any fiscal year to make grants to community-based organizations.		No comparable provision.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	Requires an application submitted by a community-based organization to contain evidence that the affected LEAs concur with the proposed project.		
<u>Allowable Activities</u> Provides a list of 13 allowable activities, of which at least four must be included in a funded project.	Requires that all projects offer significant expanded learning opportunities, such as before and after school, for children and youth in the community. The list of 13 activities would remain allowable uses of funds, but none would be mandatory.		Same as current law.
<u>Definition of “Community learning center”</u> Defines “community learning center” as an entity within a public school building that provides a variety of services for residents of all ages and is operated by a local educational agency in conjunction with other public and private agencies and organizations.	Modifies the definition to require the entity to provide expanded learning opportunities and permit the entity to provide services that address other needs. Would mandate that a center operated by a local educational agency be located within a public elementary or secondary school building.		Same as current law.

Title X, Part H, High School Reform

<u>Program Authorized</u> No comparable program.	Supports the planning and implementation of educational reforms in high schools, particularly high-poverty urban and rural high schools.	No comparable program.	No comparable program, but bill combines the “Smaller Learning Communities” authority.
---	--	------------------------	--

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	Authorizes competitive awards to LEAs. Requires, to the extent possible, that a majority of awards are made to assist high schools that participate in Title I programs or serve a high-poverty attendance area. Grants are for up to 3 years.		
	<u>Program Focus</u> Carry out reforms to ensure that each high school assisted: (1) is a place where students receive individual attention and support; (2) provides all students with challenging coursework; (3) motivates all students to learn; (4) provides students with a continuous and integrated education; (5) helps students achieve their academic and career goals; and (6) functions as a center for the community.		
	<u>Incentive Payments</u> Authorizes incentive payments to teachers and administrators in selected grantee schools if their students demonstrate significant gains in achievement.		

Title X, Part I, Elementary School Foreign Language Assistance Program

<u>Program authorized</u> Current Title VII-B authorizes three-year discretionary grants to SEAs and LEAs to pay the Federal share of the cost of	Replaces Title VII-B into a new authority under which all activities would be at the elementary level, except that LEAs could	Does not reauthorize the current program or replace it with a new authority.	Same as current law.
--	---	--	----------------------

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p>innovative elementary and secondary foreign language programs.</p> <p>Also authorizes a Foreign Language Incentive formula grants to schools operating foreign language programs that develop communicative competency.</p>	<p>include support for secondary school instruction, so long as that instruction is part of an articulated elementary-through-secondary school foreign language program.</p> <p>Repealed.</p>	<p>Repealed.</p>	<p>Same as current law.</p>
<p><u>Eligible Applicants</u></p> <p>No comparable requirements.</p> <p>LEAs may receive grants if the Secretary determines that the program shows promise of being continued beyond the grant period and demonstrates approaches that can be disseminated.</p>	<p>States that have, or are establishing, State standards for foreign language instruction or that require foreign language instruction in all public elementary schools.</p> <p>LEAs that propose programs likely to be continued beyond the grant period, demonstrate approaches that can be disseminated, include performance measurements and assessment systems, and use curriculum that is aligned with State standards.</p>		<p>Same as current law.</p> <p>Same as current law.</p>
<p><u>Authorized activities</u></p> <p>No comparable provisions.</p>	<p>SEAs may use grants for activities such as developing foreign language standards and developing new certification requirements for elementary school foreign language teachers.</p>		<p>Same as current law.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
No comparable provision.	LEAs may use funds for activities such as: professional development and coordination of elementary programs with secondary school programs.		Same as current law.
<u>Reports</u> No comparable provisions.	SEAs must submit an annual report that provides information on the project's progress in reaching its goals. LEAs must annually report on student gains in comprehending, speaking, reading, and writing a foreign language as compared to State foreign language standards.		No comparable provisions.

Title X, Part J – Rural Education Initiative

<u>Program authorized</u>		<u>Small and Rural School Program</u> (Subpart I)	<u>Small and Rural School Program</u> (Title VI, Part B)
Authorizes the Secretary to make competitive grants to rural LEAs to assist in local school improvement efforts. If the amount available for this subpart is \$50 million or greater, the Secretary must ensure that at least one eligible LEA in each State receives an award.	Repeals current Part J.	<u>Program authorized</u> Allows an eligible LEA to use “applicable funds” for activities that support local or statewide educational reform efforts to improve academic achievement and the quality of instruction.	Same as House.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Authorizes separate grants to IHEs or consortia of IHEs or partnerships between an IHE and rural schools and LEAs to undertake local school improvement activities.		Also authorizes the Secretary to make formula grants to eligible LEAs to support local or statewide educational reform efforts to improve academic achievement and the quality of instruction.	Same as House.
<u>Eligibility</u> Makes eligible an LEA that (1)(A) has at least 15 percent of its students eligible to be counted under Part A of Title I and (B) is not in a metropolitan statistical area or (2)(A) serves fewer than 2,500 students and (B) does not serve schools in a metropolitan statistical area.		Makes eligible an LEA that (1) serves fewer than 600 students; and has a USDA Rural-Urban Continuum Code of 6, 7, 8, or 9; or (2) serves fewer than 600 students and receives a waiver from the Secretary from the Continuum Code requirement.	Makes eligible an LEA that serves fewer than 600 students; and has a School Locale Code of 7.
		<u>Applicable funding</u> Funds received under Titles II, IV, and VI and Parts A and C of Title VII and Part I of Title X.	Funds received under Titles II, IV, and VI.
		<u>Formula allocation</u> \$20,000 plus \$100 per child for every child over 50 in average daily attendance with a maximum total award of \$60,000, minus the amount of applicable funding received the in previous fiscal year.	Same as House.
		Authorizes a ratable reduction in the amount of awards if insufficient funds are appropriated .	No comparable provision.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		<u>Accountability</u> Requires that LEAs administer assessments that meet the Title I requirements. Requires that LEAs using funds for alternative uses meet the Title I adequate yearly progress requirements.	Requires that LEAs administer assessments that meet the Title I requirements or another test that the LEA uses to assess the academic achievement of students. Requires that LEAs using funds for alternative uses show improvements in student achievement after the fifth year of participation.
		<u>Low-Income and Rural School Program</u> <u>Program authorized</u> Formula awards to States to allow eligible LEAs to carry out authorized activities.	Same as House.
		<u>Federal formula allocations</u> 0.5 percent for BIA schools; formula grants to States based on each State's share of average daily attendance in eligible districts.	Formula grants to States based on each State's share of average daily attendance in eligible districts.
		<u>Eligibility</u> Makes eligible an LEA that has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent and is in a non-metropolitan county with a population of less than 20,000.	Same as House.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
		<u>Within-State allocations</u> SEA may reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for administrative expenses. SEA must award at least 95 percent of its allocation to eligible LEAs either (1) competitively or (2) by a formula based on average daily attendance. Eligible LEAs in States that choose not to participate in the program may apply directly to the Secretary. The Secretary may award competitively the amount of the nonparticipating State's allocation.	Same as House. Same as House. Same as House.
Current Part J authorizes 10 uses of funds, including programs to (1) increase the academic achievement of rural students and prepare them to enter postsecondary institutions; (2) provide teachers with professional development opportunities; (3) recruit and retain qualified teachers; (4) improve the access of rural schools to educational technology; and (5) decrease the use of drugs and alcohol.		<u>Uses of funds</u> Educational technology; professional development; technical assistance; teacher recruitment and retention; parental involvement activities; or academic enrichment programs.	Same broad use of funds authorized under Title VI, Part A.
		<u>Special rule</u> An LEA may not receive an award under the Small and Rural Schools and the Low-Income and Rural Schools program in the same fiscal year.	Same as House.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
Title X, Part K, National Writing Project			
<u>Program Focus</u> Authorizes the Secretary to make a grant to the National Writing Project, a nonprofit educational organization that has as its primary purpose the improvement of the quality of student writing and learning, and the teaching of writing in the Nation’s classrooms.	No changes.	Reauthorizes current program.	Reauthorizes current program.
<u>Classroom Teacher Grants</u> Permits up to 5% of the amount appropriated for the entire National Writing Project to fund grants for classroom teachers. These grants would cover the Federal share of the cost of enabling classroom teachers to conduct classroom research, publish models of student writing, conduct “best practice” research, and other activities to improve the teaching of writing. Grants may not exceed \$2,000, and must supplement State and local funds allocated for these purposes.	Repealed.	Maintains current law.	Repealed.
<u>Program Evaluation</u> <i>Requires</i> the Secretary to conduct an independent evaluation, by grant or contract, of the <i>teacher training</i> programs administered pursuant to this <i>Act</i> , including the amount of funds expended	<i>Permits</i> the Secretary to conduct and independent evaluation of the National Writing Project.	Maintains current law.	Maintains current law.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
by the National Writing Project. Requires the results of the evaluation to be provided to Congress.			

TITLE XI – GENERAL PROVISIONS

Improving Education Through Accountability

Statewide <u>Accountability System and Plan</u> No comparable provision.	<p>Requires each State that receives assistance under ESEA to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop and implement a statewide system for holding LEAs and schools accountable for student performance by: (1) identifying LEAs and schools in need of improvement; (2) intervening in those schools and LEAs to improve teaching and learning; and (3) implementing corrective actions if necessary. <p>Develop and submit to the Secretary an accountability plan that addresses the requirements for: (1) turning around failing schools; (2) student progress and promotion policy; (3) ensuring teacher quality; (4) having a sound discipline policy; and (5) producing State, LEA, and school report cards. In addition, the plan must have the concurrence of the Governor and SEA.</p>	<p>Requires system similar to Administration proposal for Title I, Part A, and for Straight A’s if Title I funds are included in Straight A’s grants.</p> <p>No comparable provision.</p>	<p>Same as House.</p> <p>Same as House.</p>
---	---	---	---

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report annually to the Secretary on State progress toward implementing the accountability plans. 	No comparable provision.	Same as House.
<u>Social Promotion and Retention</u>	Requires States to have a policy that is designed to ensure that students have progressed through school on a timely basis having met challenging standards and end the practices of social promotion and retention. The policy must include: providing educational interventions needed to ensure all that students meet challenging academic standards; requiring students to demonstrate that they have met the standards at 3 key transition points, one of which must be graduation from secondary school; requiring LEAs to provide all students with qualified teachers who are supported by high-quality professional development; and providing students who have not met the standards with appropriate interventions to help them meet the standards. This policy must be fully implemented within 4 years.	No comparable provision.	No comparable provision.
<u>Qualified Teachers</u>	Requires States to have a policy that is designed to ensure that there is a qualified teacher in every classroom by requiring that: (1) at least 95 percent of teachers	Similar to Administration bill.	No comparable provision.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	within the State are certified or have a baccalaureate and are enrolled in a certification program; (2) at least 95 percent of the teachers in secondary schools within the State are teaching a subject in which they have an academic major or demonstrated competency; (3) unqualified teachers are not disproportionately concentrated in particular LEAs; and (4) the certification process for new teachers includes an assessment of content knowledge and teaching skills.		
<u>Discipline</u>	Requires States to have a policy that requires LEAs and schools to implement sound and equitable discipline policies to ensure a safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environment in every school.	No comparable provision.	No comparable provision.
<u>State Report Cards</u>	Requires States to have a policy that requires an annual state-level report card containing data on: (1) student performance on statewide assessments in reading and mathematics, as well as any other subjects for which the State requires assessments; (2) attendance and graduation rates for public schools in the State; (3) average class size in each district in the State; (4) the incidence of school violence and drug and alcohol abuse, and the number of instances in which a student	Requires similar report card for Title I schools.	No similar provision.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	<p>possessed a firearm at school; and (5) the professional qualifications of teachers in the State. A State may include other information that it deems appropriate to reflect school quality and student achievement. The State report card must provide statistically sound data, disaggregated for gender, race, ethnic group, migrant status, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and students with limited English proficiency. State report cards must be posted on the Internet, disseminated to all LEAs and schools in the State, and made available to the public.</p>		
<p><u>Local Report Cards</u></p>	<p>Requires States to have a policy that requires LEAs and schools to produce report cards containing the same information required of States. In addition, LEA report cards must include: (1) the number of low-performing schools; and (2) information on how students in the LEA performed on statewide assessments compared to other students in the State. School report cards must identify whether the school has been identified as low-performing and how its students have performed on statewide assessments compared to other students in the LEA. LEA report cards must be distributed to all schools served by the LEA and made widely available to the public; school</p>	<p>Similar to Administration bill for all Title I schools.</p>	<p>No comparable provision.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
	report cards must be made available to all parents in the school and broadly available to the public.		
<u>Sanctions</u>	Provides sanctions the Secretary may impose on a State that fails to substantially carry out one of the accountability provisions or meet a performance indicator in its plan.	Straight A's proposal includes sanctions similar to Administration bill.	Same as House bill.

Title XI – Rewards and Recognition

	<p>Requires the Secretary to establish a system for recognizing and rewarding States determined to have demonstrated significant, statewide achievement gains in core subjects, as measured by NAEP for three consecutive years, have closed the gap between high- and low-performing students, and have in place strategies for continuous improvement.</p> <p>Authorizes appropriations for this purpose.</p>	<p>Requires awards to States that reduce the achievement gap, by 25 percent over 5 years.</p> <p>Requires reservation of funds under FIE.</p>	<p>Includes two separate programs of awards to States. The Education Performance Partnerships (EPP) rewards States that exceed the national average in reducing the gap in three of four NAEP categories and the Academic Achievement Awards is the same as the House.</p> <p>Authorizes one time mandatory appropriation for EEP (Part G) and requires reservation of funds under FIE for closing the gap bonus awards under Part H.</p>
--	---	---	---

Title IX – Transferability

		Authorizes States to transfer up to 100 percent of non-administrative State-level funds from any of six programs	
--	--	--	--

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
No comparable provision.	No comparable provision.	<p>(Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants, Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grants, Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, Title VI, and CSRD) to any other program on the list or to Title I. States transferring funds must modify their State plans to reflect any transfers.</p> <p>Authorizes LEAs to transfer funds from any of a list of six programs (including Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants, Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grants, Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, Title VI, Class Size Reduction, and Immigrant Education) to any other program on the list or to Title I. Transfers of more than 30 percent of allocations require State approval. LEAs transferring funds must modify their program plans to reflect any transfers.</p>	No comparable provision.
Title XI, America's Education Goals			
Authorizes the establishment of a panel to: (1) report annually to the President, Secretary, and Congress on progress toward achieving the National Education Goals; (2) review voluntary national content and student performance standards; (3) report on promising or effective actions being taken at the national, State, and local levels, and in the public and private sectors, to achieve the	Renames the Panel as the America's Education Goals Panel. Makes necessary updates and clarifications.	No action as of 5/00.	Same as Administration proposal.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
National Goals; and (4) help build a nationwide, bipartisan consensus for the reforms necessary to achieve the Goals.			

TITLE XII – OTHER AMENDMENTS

Education for Homeless Children and Youth (McKinney Act)

(McKinney Act) <u>Statement of Policy</u> Focus is on ensuring that all homeless children and youth have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education available to other children.	Expands on the current purpose to ensure that homeless children are not segregated based on their status as homeless. Prohibits a State receiving funds under this subtitle from segregating a homeless child or youth, either in a separate school or in a separate program within a school, except for short periods of time because of health and safety emergencies or to provide short-term services to meet the unique needs of homeless children and youth.	Same as Administration policy, but allows States with existing segregated schools to continue to remain eligible to receive funds.	Same as Administration proposal.
<u>State Activities</u> Requires States to estimate numbers of homeless children and youth in the State and the number of homeless children and youth served by the program.	Eases burden on States by requiring, in place of the State data collection, that the Secretary periodically collect and disseminate data and information on the number and location of homeless children and youth, the services they receive, and the extent to which such needs are being met.	Same as Administration proposal.	Same as Administration proposal.

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<p><u>State Plan</u></p> <p>Included in the plan are requirements that LEAs comply with the parents' interests, to the extent feasible, when determining the school that a homeless child will attend.</p>	<p>Requires school districts to maintain homeless children in their school of origin to the greatest extent feasible.</p>	<p>Same as Administration proposal.</p>	<p>Same as Administration proposal.</p>
<p><u>Grants to LEAs</u></p> <p>Authorizes States to award grants to LEAs that submit an application on the basis of need, but does not specify whether these grants are to be awarded competitively.</p>	<p>Clarifies that subgrants to local educational agencies are to be awarded competitively on the basis of the quality of the program and the need for assistance.</p>	<p>Same as Administration proposal.</p>	<p>Same as Administration proposal.</p>
<p><u>LEA Responsibilities</u></p> <p>Requires every LEA that receives a subgrant to designate a homeless liaison to ensure that homeless children are enrolled in, and succeed in, school and that homeless families and children receive equitable access to education and other support services.</p>	<p>Requires all districts in which homeless children reside or attend school to designate a homeless liaison responsible for ensuring that homeless children are regularly attending school and are receiving equitable access to high-quality education and support services.</p> <p>Also requires school districts to post public notices regarding the educational rights of homeless children and youth in family shelters, soup kitchens, health clinics, and elsewhere.</p>	<p>Maintains requirement for a State coordinator; does not include Administration's proposal for a coordinator in districts in which homeless children reside or attend school.</p>	<p>Requires all districts in which homeless children reside or attend school to designate a homeless liaison responsible for ensuring that homeless children have full and equal opportunity to succeed; receive educational referrals for programs under which they are eligible, including Head Start, Even Start, and preschool programs; and inform parents/guardians of educational and related opportunities.</p> <p>Same as Administration proposal.</p>

Current Law	Administration ¹	House ²	Senate ³
<u>Secretarial Responsibilities</u> No similar provision.	No similar provision.	No similar provision.	Requires the Secretary to develop, issue, and publish, within 60 days of enactment of the bill, guidelines for States that describe successful ways a State may assist LEAs to enroll homeless children and youth immediately in school and how States can review and revise immunization, medical record, and school record requirements as appropriate and necessary to ensure the enrollment of homeless children and youth more quickly.